POLITICAL HISTORY OF ANCIENT INDIA

FROM THE ACCESSION OF PARIKSHIT TO THE EXTINCTION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY

BY

HEMCHANDRA RAYCHAUDHURI, M A., Ph.D. F.R.A.S.B.

FORMERLY CARMICHAEL PROFESSOR AND HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF HISTORY AND ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE, CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY ; AUTHOR OF "THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE VAISHNAVA SECT," "STUDIES IN INDIAN ANTIQUITIES," "VIKRAMADITYA IN HISTORY AND LEGEND," JOINT-AUTHOR OF "THE GROUNDWORK OF INDIAN HISTORY," "AN ADVANCED HISTORY OF INDIA," "AGE OF THE NANDAS AND MAURYAS," ETC.

SEVENTH EDITION

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1972

To

Sir Asutosh Mookerjee

in token of grateful regard and esteem

HEMCHANDRA RAYCHAUDHURI
(1892-1957)

[Reproduced from
the *Journal of Ancient Indian History*,
Calcutta University, Vol. I,
1967-68.]

HEMCHANDRA RAYCHAUDHURI

(1892-1957)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

When Hemchandra Raychaudhuri passed away in Calcutta in the evening of the 4th of May, 1957, very few Indians realised the nature of the loss caused by the sad demise of the great scholar. But, to those who were acquainted with him personally or with his invaluable works, the news came as a rude shock, even though they knew that he had been suffering from a protracted illness and that there was little hope of his recovery. Still it was a great loss to them, since, even from his sick-bed, Raychaudhuri was acting as a source of inspiration to the sincere students of history.

At the beginning of his *magnum opus*, *Political History of Ancient India* published by the University of Calcutta, Raychaudhuri observes, "No Thucydides or Tacitus has left for posterity a genuine history of ancient India", and he took upon himself the task of reconstructing this lost history in greater details than what was offered in the earlier part of Smith's celebrated *Early History of India*. Smith's attempt practically relates to the period beginning with Alexander's invasion of India in 327-324 B C even though he wrote a few pages on the earlier period from c 600 B.C. But Raychaudhuri pushed back the commencement of the historical period to the 9th century B.C when the great Kuru king Parikshit flourished according to the chronological scheme proposed by him.

In the first part of this magnificent work, Raychaudhuri dealt with the pre-Bimbisara period of Indian history on the basis of a careful analysis of the early Indian literary traditions which, as he showed, are not devoid of genuine historical elements. It was no easy task. He had to go through the entire Vedic and Epico-Purānic literature and various other Sanskrit and Prakrit works as well as the Buddhist and Jain texts. But proper utilisation of the great mass of material thus collected is more difficult, since that requires special competence. However, Raychaudhuri was eminently suited to the work. The great popularity of his *Political History of Ancient India (from the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty)* is clearly demonstrated by the fact that it has run no less than six editions since its first appearance in 1923.

Hemchandra Raychaudhuri was born on the 8th April, 1892, in the village of Ponabalia in the Buckergunge District. Son of

Manoranjan Raychaudhuri, Zamindar of Ponabalia, and Tarangini Devi, Hemchandra received his early education at the Brajamohan Institution, one of the best schools of the time, founded by Aswinikumar Datta at Barisal. He passed the Entrance examination of Calcutta University in 1907 having stood first among the students of the then province of East Bengal and Assam. Thereafter he came to Calcutta and studied first at the General Assembly's Institution (later Scottish Churches College) and then at the Presidency College from which he graduated in 1911 Having stood first among all the Honours Graduates of Calcutta University during that year, Hemchandra obtained the Eshan scholarship In 1913 he stood first in the M.A examination in History and subsequently became a Griffith Prizeman in 1919 and was also admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) of Calcutta University in 1921

Immediately after obtaining his M A degree, Raychaudhuri worked first as a Lecturer at the Bangabasi College, Calcutta, for a short time (1913-14) and then joined the Bengal Education Service and served at the Presidency College, Calcutta, for three years (1914-16). In 1916, he was transferred to the Government College, Chittagong About this time, he was considerably distressed owing to the illness of his wife, whose untimely death soon afterwards acted heavily upon his nerves, and the transfer increased his troubles Fortunately, Sir Asutosh Mookerjee was then in need of talented youngmen for the new course of Ancient Indian History and Culture introduced in the University of Calcutta He offered a lectureship to Raychaudhuri who readily gave up his post in the Bengal Education Service and joined the University as a Lecturer in 1917 In 1936 when D R. Bhandarkar retired, Raychaudhuri succeeded him as Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, a position that he held down to June, 1952. Before this appointment, for a year in 1928, he acted as Reader and Head of the Department of History at the University of Dacca.

As a man, Raychaudhuri had an extremely affectionate and sensitive nature. Whoever came into his contact was charmed by his amiable behaviour He was an exceptionally successful and inspiring teacher. But he lived more or less a life of seclusion, though the urge for knowledge never allowed him any rest. He devoted all his time and energy in studies. Dr. R C. Majumdar, while paying tribute to his memory, remarked that Hemchandra knew nothing but books.

Raychaudhuri's scholarship was universally recognised His treatment of historical topics was characterised by originality, sound

judgement and learning, and he never sacrificed critical caution to the passion for novel theories Indeed, Raychaudhuri's name was a guarantee for dependable work. In 1946, he was made a Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and later, in 1951, was awarded the Society's B. C Law gold medal for his contribution to the cause of Ancient Indian History and Culture In 1941, he had presided over a section of the Indian History Congress held at Hyderabad, while he was elected General President of the Congress for its Nagpur Session held in 1950.

It is interesting to note that, as an author, Raychaudhuri was not exceptionally prolific, and this is because he insisted on quality rather than quantity His second famous work, entitled *Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect*, was published by Calcutta University and has run two editions (1920 and 1936) It is regarded as the most useful source book by all serious students of Vaishnavism Raychaudhuri also contributed a number of articles to learned periodicals, all of which have been incorporated in his *Studies in Indian Antiquities* (1932 and 1958), the second edition of which, also published by the University of Calcutta, appeared a year after his death The papers in this volume are characterised by clarity of thought and are suggestive of the vast range of Raychaudhuri's scholarship He contributed chapters to such works as the Dacca University's *History of Bengal*, Vol I (1942) Even when he was bed-ridden, he contributed an important chapter to the *Early History of the Deccan* edited by G. Yazdani He wrote the *Advanced History of India* (for B A. Students) in collaboration with R C Majumdar and K. K Datta *

* From the *Prāchyavidyā tarangini* (Golden Jubilee Volume of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture) edited by Prof D C Sircar, University of Calcutta, 1969, pp 901-04 cf *Journal of Ancient Indian History* Vol I, 1967-68 pp 1 ff

FOREWORD

My teacher, the late Professor H. C. Raychaudhuri, was suffering from illness for several years before his untimely death in 1957. That is why it was not possible for him to revise, to his satisfaction, certain sections of Part II of his *Political History* in the light of the discoveries made even some years before the latest edition of the work came out in 1953. A number of important records have also come out since that date. As Raychaudhuri's book still remains the most reliable and comprehensive treatment of the subject and is in great demand among the students of early Indian history, the University of Calcutta deserves our sincere thanks for bringing out the present reprint. When at the final stage of its printing, Dr. A. K. Raychaudhuri, son of the late Professor, saw me for the elucidation of a few minor points, I thought of adding a list of at least a few of the many important epigraphic, numismatic and literary records which have been discovered, studied or re-studied during the past two decades and throw light on the problems discussed by the author The intention is of course to lead inquisitive students to further study of some of the topics The epigraphic records, mostly appearing in the *Epigraphia Indica*, have been enumerated according to the order of their publication.

1. Mandasor (Mandsaur District, Madhya Pradesh) inscription (*Ep. Ind*, Vol XXVII, pp 12 ff.), dated Mālava year 524 (467 A D.), which speaks indirectly of the rule of Govindagupta, son of Chandragupta II, in Western India or the Malwa region apparently at an earlier date There is no reason to believe that Govindagupta ruled for some time from the Imperial Gupta throne (cf *Journ. Anc. Ind Hist.*, Vol. III, pp 101 ff.)

2. Sumandala (Ganjam District, Orissa) copper-plate inscription (*Ep Ind*, Vol XXVIII, pp 79 ff) of Prithivivigraha-bhaṭṭāraka, dated Gupta year 250 (569 A.D.), issued when Gupta sovereignty was prevalent in the area (cf. *Gupta-rājye varttamāne* with a similar phrase in Bhandarkar's List, No 1068: *Aṅgareja-rājye varttamāne*). This has to be read in relation to the Jain literary tradition in Jinasena's *Harivaṁśa*, to which Raychaudhuri himself first drew our attention and which speaks of the duration of Gupta rule as 231 years and indirectly of the fall of the Guptas about the Gupta year 231 (550 A.D.). Now we have traced another Jain literary tradition, side by side with the said one, in Yati Basaha's

Tiloyapannatti, giving the duration of Gupta rule as 252 years, so that Gupta sovereignty ended about 571 A.D.; and we have suggested that the Guptas lost their hold on U P and Bihar about 550 A.D., but continued to dominate Orissa and the neighbouring regions till 571 A.D. See *Essays presented to Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, ed H. R. Gupta, 1958, pp. 343 ff

3. Badaganā (Sibsagar District, Assam) inscription (*Ep. Ind*, Vol. XXX, pp. 62 ff) of Bhūtivarman. It was formerly supposed to contain a date in the Gupta year 234 or 244; but a careful examination has shown that the record is undated. Bhūtivarman's epithet 'performer of the horse-sacrifice' is interesting because the seal of Bhāskaravarman assigns the performance of Aśvamedha not to Bhūtivarman, but to two other rulers.

4. Pedda-Dugam (Srikakulam District, Andhra Pradesh) copper-plate inscription (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 89 ff.) issued by Śatrudamana (about the fifth century A.D.) owing allegiance to a *Bhaṭṭāraka* who seems to have been a Gupta emperor.

5. Gujarra (Datia District, Madhya Pradesh) MRE (*ibid.*, pp. 205 ff.) of Aśoka. This text of MRE I has a passage which throws light on the intermingling of gods and men in his empire as claimed by Aśoka It says that people who followed Aśoka's *Dharma* would, as a result, be able to mingle with gods

6. Kailvan (Patna District, Bihar) inscription (*ibid.*, pp 229 ff) of Ārya-Viśākhamitra who was ruling over the area in question in the Kaṇishka or Śaka year 108 (186 A D.) The use of the era of 78 A.D. in this record seems to be related to the question of expansion of Kushāṇa power in Eastern India. See Sircar, *Problems of Kushāṇa and Rājpūt History*, pp 52 ff.

7 Kurud (Raipur District, Madhya Pradesh) copper-plate inscription (*Ep Ind.*, Vol. XXXI, pp 267 f.) of king Narendra of Śarabhapura, who flourished about 500 A D. The inscription shows that the early members of this ruling family owed allegiance to a *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* apparently of the Gupta dynasty.

8. Erragudi (Karnul District, Andhra Pradesh) Edicts (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 1 ff) of Aśoka. These contain the two Minor and the fourteen Major Rock Edicts. Their discovery has helped scholars in locating Suvarnagiri, capital of the southern province of Aśoka's empire, at Zonnagiri near Erragudi.

9. Copper coin of Harigupta (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXIII, pp 95 ff) The Garuḍa reverse of the coin was imitated from the coins of Chandragupta II The same Harigupta may be the *Gupta-vaṁśodita* Harirāja of the Ichchhawar inscription (*loc cit.*); but he was a local ruler of the East Malwa region about the fifth century A D. and did not belong to the Imperial Gupta dynasty.

10. Bhumara (Satna District, Madhya Pradesh) inscription (*ibid.*, pp. 167 ff.) Formerly it was believed that the inscribed pillar was the boundary post between the kingdoms of the Parivrājaka *Mahārāja* Hastin and the Uchchakalpīya *Mahārāja* Sarvanātha ; but the recent study has shown that an area named 'Mahārāja-Sarvanātha-bhoga' (literally, 'the *jāgīr* in the possession of *Mahārāja* Sarvanātha') formed a part of Hastin's kingdom

11. Supia (former Rewa State, Madhya Pradesh) inscription (*ibid*, pp 306 ff) of the time of Skandagupta, dated Gupta year 141 (460 A.D.) In this record, the Gupta genealogy is begun from Ghatotkacha (not from Ghatotkacha's father Gupta) as in Prabhāvatiguptā's grants, and the Gupta emperors Chandragupta II and Kumāragupta I are mentioned by their titles, viz., Vikramāditya and Mahendrāditya respectively.

12. Kandahar (Afghanistan) MRE (*ibid*, pp 333 ff ; Vol XXXIV, pp 1 ff.) of Aśoka in two versions, viz. Greek and Aramaic, meant respectively for the Yavana and Kamboja subjects of the Maurya emperor. The Aramaic version represents the local officers as mentioning Priyadarśin (Aśoka) as 'our lord' and points to the inclusion of wide areas of Afghanistan in the Maurya empire

13 Mathura (U.P) inscription (*ibid*, Vol XXXIV, pp 9 ff.) of year 4 of Kanishka's reign. The record shows that, like Śrāvasti, Vārāṇasī and Kauśāmbī in U P, Mathurā also formed a part of Kanishka's empire early in his reign.

14 Chitorgarh (Rajasthan) inscription of Aulikara Yaśodharman (*ibid*, pp 53 ff) The inscription suggests that the city of Madhyamā (Madhyamikā), modern Nagarī near Chitor was an administrative centre of the Aulikara dominions

15 Nagarjunikonda (Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh) inscription (*ibid*, pp 197 ff.) of Ābhīra Vasushena The record seems to be dated in the year 30 of the era of 248 A D., i.e in 278 A.D., and to indicate the temporary occupation of the Ikshvāku capital, viz. Vijayapurī in the Nagarjunikonda valley, by the Ābhīras of Maharashtra

16 Varanasi (U P) Sanskrit University Museum inscription (*ibid*, pp. 243 ff) of the time of Rudradāmaśrī who seems to have had the blood of the Śaka Satraps of Western India in his veins and ruled over Eastern U P in the third century A.D

17. Amaravati (Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh) pillar inscription (*ibid.*, Vol. XXXV, pp. 40 ff.). The record has been regarded as a fragment of an Aśokan Pillar Edict. In that case, this is the only Pillar Edict of the Maurya king so far discovered in South India, and Aśoka may be associated with the earliest phase of the Buddhist establishment at Amaravati.

18. Coins of the so-called Mahisha dynasty (*ibid*., pp. 69 ff.). Some coins of about the third century A.D., discovered in the southern part of the former Hyderabad State, were attributed to a ruler of the Mahisha dynasty of Śaka origin ; but, with the help of similar other coins, it has been shown that the letters *Mahasa*... in the legend stand not for *Mahisha*, but for *Mahāse*[*nāpatisa*], so that the existence of the Mahisha dynasty is imaginary.

19. Silver coin of Vāsishṭhīputra Śātakarni (*ibid*., pp. 247 ff.). Formerly silver coinage (imitated from the Śaka type) only of Gautamīputra Yajña-Śātakarṇi (c. 178-202 A.D.) was known, so that it was supposed to prove his conquest of the Thana District from the Śaka Satraps of Western India Now we have similar coins of his predecessors, viz., Vāsishthīputra Pulumāvi (c 131-59 A D.) and Vāsishthīputra Śātakarni (c 159-65 A.D.) who had in their possession the Nasik-Poona region, and apparently Thana also, which had been conquered by Gautamīputra Śātakarni (c. 106-31 A D.) from the Kshaharāta-Śaka Satrap Nahapāna about 124 A.D. The other tracts conquered by Gautamīputra from Nahapāna were reconquered by the Kārdamaka-Śaka Satraps Chashtana and Rudradāman. See also Sircar, ***Studies** in Indian Coins*, pp 107 ff., and *Ancient Malwa and the Vikramāditya Tradition*, pp. 88-89, 104. The legend on Vāsishthīputra Śātakarni's coin, exhibiting the Dravidian forms of Middle Brāhmī and Prakrit speech, helped us in reading the damaged part of the legend on the coin of Gautamīputra Yajña-Śātakarni

20. Dhārikāṭura grant of Achandavarman (*Ep. Ind*, Vol. XXXVI, pp 1 ff.). The inscription shows how formerly the name Achaṇḍavarman was wrongly read in various epigraphs by all scholars as Chandavarman

21. Ahraura (Mirzapur District, U P.) MRE of Aśoka (*ibid*, pp. 239 ff.). An interesting passage in the last sentence of the record shows that MRE I was issued when Aśoka passed 256 nights away from his capital in the course of a tour of pilgrimage which he had undertaken after the installation of the Buddha's corporeal relics on a platform apparently for worship at Pāṭaliputra For *vivutha*, etc., see *Ind. Hist. Quart*., Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 222-24

22. Nagarjunikonda (Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh) inscription (*Ep. Ind*., Vol. XXXVI, pp. 273 f) of Gautamīputra Vijaya-Śātakarṇi of the Śātavāhana dynasty, dated in his sixth regnal year. The record supports the Purānic reference to the Andhra king named Vijaya and shows that the Buddhist establishment at Nagarjunikonda, so long attributed to the Ikshvākus, started under Later Śātavāhana patronage.

23. Hisse-Borala (Akola District, Maharashtra) inscription (*ibid*., Vol. XXXVII, pp. 1 ff.; *Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist*., Vol. I,

pp. 94 ff.) of Vākāṭaka Devasena, dated in Śaka 380 (458 A.D.). This is the only definitely dated record of the Vākāṭaka dynasty, and also offers the earliest reference to the association of the Śakas with the era of 78 A.D. Another important feature of the inscription is that it equates Śaka 380 (458 A.D.) with the year 3020 of a cyclic reckoning of the astronomers.

24. Kandahar (Afghanistan) version of RE XII and XIII of Aśoka in Greek (*ibid.*, pp. 103 ff.; *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakshmī and Sarasvatī in Art and Literature*, ed Sircar, pp. 25 ff.) This fragmentary record suggests that all the Major Rock edicts of the Maurya emperor may have been engraved at the place which was the headquarters of a district inhabited mostly by the Yavanas (Greeks).

25. Copper coins of Rāmagupta (*Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XL, Part III, December 1962, pp 533 ff.). The coins, it has been suggested, prove that there was a ruler named Rāmagupta in Malwa, but not that he belonged to the Imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha and ruled at Pātaliputra about 376 A.D The coins resemble the Mālava and Nāga issues, some of them being imitated from Gupta coins like the issues of Harigupta and Indragupta who did not belong to the Imperial Gupta house.

26. *Paramadaivata* (*Indian Studies · Past & Present*, Vol. V, No. 1, October-December, 1963, pp. 89 ff.). It has been shown that the title has no Imperial association, but merely means 'devoted to the gods'.

27. Ariaka (*Journ. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. XLIII, Part III, December, 1965, pp. 693 ff.). Here an attempt has been made to show that 'Ariake of the Sadenoi' in Ptolemy's Geography (c. 145 A.D.) means 'Aparānta of the Śātavāhanas' which included the present Thana District, but that the Ariake of the *Periplus* (c. 82 A.D) included Southern Gujarat later called Lāta (Ptolemy's Larike which formed a part of the dominions of Tiastenes, i.e Chashtana, and also of the latter's successor, Rudradāman).

28. Matrimonial Relations between Seleucus and Chandragupta (*Journ. Anc. Ind. Hist.*, Vol. I, pp. 87 ff.) It has been shown that there was no difficulty for the Maurya king in marrying a Greek princess because in India a king could choose his bride from any other royal family irrespective of caste considerations.

29 Andhau (Kutch, Gujarat) inscription (*ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 104 ff.) of Chashṭana, dated in the year 11 (89 A.D.) The record shows that Chashtana's territory included Kutch as early as the eighties of the first century A.D. and that he was a Satrap under Kaṇishka I (78-102 A.D.).

30. Guntupally (West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh)

inscriptions (*ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 23 ff.). The records prove the rule of the Mahāmeghavāhana king Sada, called lord of Kaliṅga and Māhishaka, over the said region. The king, who ruled about the second century A.D. was wrongly identified with Khāravela who flourished in the first century B.C.

31. Mankuwar (Allahabad District, U.P.) inscription (*ibid.*, pp. 133 ff.) of the time of Kumāragupta I. The date of the inscription is not the Gupta year 129 (448 A.D.), but the year 109 (428 A.D.). This reading suggests the introduction of the decimal system in India as early as the beginning of the fifth century A.D

32. Vidisha (Madhya Pradesh) inscription (*ibid.*, pp. 145 ff.; *Journ. Or. Inst.*, Vol. XVIII, March, 1969, pp. 247 ff.) of *Mahārājādhirāja* Rāmagupta At attempt has been made to show that there is no reason to regard this Jain king Rāmagupta of Malwa as the Imperial Gupta monarch of 376 A.D. since the palaeography of the Vidisha records is really about a century later than that of the Sanchi inscription (412 A.D.) of Chandragupta II.

D C SIRCAR

Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture,
Calcutta University, 51/2, Hazra Road,
Calcutta-19

11 5 70

PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION

This is a reprint of the sixth edition (1953) which is the latest published by the author who passed away on the 4th May, 1957 According to the author's last wishes, the volume is presented to the public as it was finally revised by him.

The revision of the indexes has been done by Mrs. Uma Raychaudhuri, Ajayprasad, Sunanda, Sucheta and Bijayprasad. They are unfortunately not exhaustive. It is also a matter of regret that misprints and blemishes could not be avoided. For these we can only crave the indulgence of sympathetic readers.

We are grateful to Dr. D. C. Sircar, the present Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University, for a suitable foreword for this edition We are also thankful for the co-operation we have received from the press.

25th April, 1970
6 Mysore Road
Calcutta 26

ANIL KUMAR RAYCHAUDHURI

PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION

The *Political History of Ancient India* now arrives at a sixth edition. The continued illness of the author makes the task of revision extremely difficult. It has not been found possible to eliminate mistakes and misprints that may have crept into the volume.

Few important discoveries have been made in the domain of Ancient Indian History and Culture of the period dealt with in the following pages, since the publication of the fifth edition in 1950. It may, however, be noted that certain copper coins of a king whose name has been read as Rāmagupta have been collected by Śrī Advani and others at Bhilsa, bearing the figure of a lion on the obverse. The identity of the ruler is still undecided. The available evidence is not sufficient to indicate whether the ruler in question was a local prince or a scion of the imperial line of Guptas. Mention may also be made of a seal said to have been discovered in the Ghositārāma monastery in course of excavations at the site of Kauśāmbī carried on by the University of Allahabad. The seal is "impressed" with one of Toramāna, the famous Hun ruler, and seems to confirm the evidence of Somadeva, a Jaina contemporary of Kṛishṇa III Rāshṭrakūṭa, regarding Hun penetration deep into the interior of the Ganges valley. The representation of Grumbates (of the Chionitai) as a Kushān ruler accepted by several scolars, is by no means certain.

The author has read with interest the learned notes on the Scythian period by Ludwig Bachhofer, Otto Maenchen Halfen, Dr. Lohuizen, and A. L. Basham, to whom recognition is due. His grateful thanks are also due to Professor Louis Renou of Paris for certain suggestion and constructive criticism.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:
July 2, 1953. H. C. R. C.

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION

A fifth edition of the *Political History of Ancient India* is now placed before scholars. The author, who has been in very poor health for a long time, has found the task of revision a difficult one. He is conscious of the fact that misprints and other faults justly open to censure have not been avoided. Fresh study of the subject and new discoveries have necessitated a thorough revision of several chapters, preparation of additional notes, omission of parts of the text and other amendments. No pains have been spared to bring the work up-to-date.

Help of various kinds, including revision of indexes, has been rendered by Mr. Durgadas Mukherji, Dr. Sudhakar Chatterji, Mr. Rabischandra Kar and Dr. Golapchandra Raychaudhuri to whom the author's acknowledgments are due.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:
March 1, 1950. H. C. R. C.

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

In placing the fourth edition of the *Political History of Ancient India* in the hands of students of Indian Antiquities the author takes the opportunity of expressing his grateful thanks to scholars and explorers who have made accessible the rich stores of ancient learning and the priceless memorials of vanished glory that hitherto lay hidden beyond the ken of students and investigators. Suggestions and criticisms that earlier editions of the present work received in recent times, though not always of an instructive and informed character, have enabled the author to restate his position in regard to many matters treated in the volume. While unwilling to dogmatise on controversial points the writer of the following pages thinks that he has adduced fresh evidence in support of some of the views that were put forward years ago, long before certain recent notes and dissertations on kindred subjects saw the light of the day. He has also sought to incorporate new material which, it is hoped, may be of some little use to the ever-widening circle of eager inquirers who are interested in the chequered annals of this ancient land.

The Cimmerian veil of darkness that enshrouds not a few obscure spaces in the spectrum of the early history of this country cannot be lifted by the wand of the magician or the trick of the conjurer. Even if such a feat were possible the author confesses that he does not possess the requisite implements.

Help in the laborious task of compiling the indexes has been given by Dr. D. C. Sircar and Professor G. C. Raychaudhuri to whom the author's acknowledgments are due.

The volume that now goes forth before the public could not be made as free from mistakes as the present writer would have wished. Some of the errors and misprints have been noted and corrected but many blunders, justly open to censure, may have escaped attention. For these the author can only crave the indulgence of readers.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:
March 31, 1938. H. C. R. C

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

The *Political History of Ancient India* now arrives at a third edition. An endeavour has been made to make it more accurate and up to date. Questions connected with certain dynasties, particularly of the Scythian period, have been treated afresh and several paragraphs have been revised in the light of the new information that may be gathered from literature as well as inscriptions discovered at Shahdaur, Maira, Khalatse, Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa, Guṇāighara and other places. Footnotes and appendices have been added to explain the author's viewpoint with regard to certain controversial matters. A new feature of the revised edition is the insertion in certain chapters, particularly of Part II, of introductory verses from literature to bring out some salient features of those chapters and incidentally, to show that poets and sages of Ancient India were not altogether unmindful of the political vicissitudes through which their country passed. The author craves the indulgence of the reader for certain misprints that have crept into the text. The labour of revising the indexes has been performed by Srijuts D. C. Raychaudhuri, G. C. Raychaudhuri and Anilkumar Raychaudhuri.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:
December 13, 1931.

H. C. R. C.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

A New edition of the *Political History of Ancient India from the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty* is placed before the public. The work has been out of print for some times and need has long been felt for a fresh edition. Therefore it goes forth once more having been revised and re-written in the light of the new information that is coming in so rapidly and in such vast bulk. No pains have been spared to bring the book up to date and make it more attractive to students. Material emendations have been made in almost every chapter. Some of the extracts in Sanskrit have been provided with English renderings.

A new feature of the present volume is the inclusion of a number of maps, and a few chronological and synchronistic tables, which, it is to be hoped, will increase the usefulness of the work. The incorporation of fresh material has necessitated a recasting of the indexes.

The present writer never intended his work to be a comprehensive survey of the political and dynastic history of every Indian province. He is chiefly concerned with those kingdoms and empires whose influence transcended provincial limits and had an important bearing upon the general course of political events in the heart and nerve-centres of the Indian sub-continent. Dynasties of mere local interest (*e.g.*, the Tamil *Prachantitas* of the far south, or the Himālayan *Pratyantas* in the far north) have received

very brief notice, as these did not acquire an all-India importance till after the Gupta period when a Jayadeva Parachakra-kāma had intimate dynastic relations with several rulers of the Indian interior, a Lalitāditya pushed his conquests as far as Kanauj, and a Rājendra Chola carried his arms to the banks of the Ganges

Further, the author does not claim for the period from Parikshit to Bimbisāra the same degree of authenticity as for the age of the Mauryas, the Sātavāhanas and the Guptas. The absence of trustworthy contemporary dynastic records makes it preposterous to put forward such a proposition. In regard to the early period it has been his principal endeavour to show that the huge fabric of sacerdotal and rhapsodic legends is not based solely on the mythical fancy of mendacious priests and story-telling Diaskeuasts; that bardic tales sometimes conceal kernels of sober facts not less trustworthy than the current accounts of the dynasties immediately preceding the raid of Alexander; and that chronological relation of the national transactions before 600 B.C. is not impossible. In trying to demonstrate this he has not confined himself to literature of a particular type, but has collated the whole mass of evidence, Vedic as well as Purāṇic, Brāhmaṇical as well as non-Brāhmaṇical, Buddhist as well as Jain, Indian as well as Hellenic

The writer of these pages wishes to acknowledge with sincere thanks his indebtedness to scholars and critics who have helped him with valuable suggestions, and especially to Dr. Barnett, Professor Schrader, Dr. Jarl Charpentier, Mr. H. Subbaiya and Mr. Asananda Nag. He is also grateful for the kind assistance which he received in many difficulties from his friends and colleagues, among whom Mr. Sailendranath Mitra, Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, Mr. H. C. Ray and Mr. J. C. Chakravorti deserve especial mention. His acknowledgments are also due to Srijut Golapchandra Raychaudhuri who gave him

much valuable help in the preparation of maps and the revision of the indexes. The author does not claim that the indexes are exhaustive, but he has spared no pains to include all important references.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA:
April 12, 1927. H. C. R. C.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The object of the following pages is to sketch the political history of Ancient India from the accession of Parikshit to the extinction of the Gupta Dynasty. The idea of the work suggested itself many years ago from observing a tendency in some of the current books to dismiss the history of the period from the Bhārata war to the rise of Buddhism as incapable of arrangement in definite chronological order. The author's aim has been to present materials for an authentic chronological history of ancient India, including the neglected post-Bhārata period, but excluding the Epoch of the Kanauj Empires which properly falls within the domain of the historian of Mediaeval India.

The volume now offered to the public consists of two parts. In the first part an attempt has been made to furnish, from a comparison of the Vedic, Epic, Purāṇic, Jaina, Buddhist and secular Brāhmaṇical literature, such a narrative of the political vicissitudes of the post-Pārikshita-pre-Bimbisārian period as may not be less intelligible to the reader than Dr. Smith's account of the transactions of the post-Bimbisārian age. It has also been thought expedient to append, towards the end of this part, a short chapter on kingship in the Brāhmaṇa-Jātaka period. The purpose of the second part is to provide a history of the period from Bimbisāra to the Guptas which will be, to a certain extent, more up to date, if less voluminous, than the classic work of Dr. Smith.

The greater part of the volume now published was written some years ago, and the author has not had

the opportunity to discuss some of the novel theories advanced in recent works like the *Cambridge History of India,* and Mr. Pargiter's *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.*

The writer of these pages offers his tribute of respect to the Hon'ble Sir Asutosh Mookerjee for providing opportunities for study which render it possible for a young learner to carry on investigation in the subject of his choice. To Professor D. R. Bhandarkar the author is grateful for the interest taken in the progress of the work. His acknowledgments are also due to Messrs. Girindramohan Sarkar and Rameschandra Raychaudhuri for their assistance in preparing the indexes. Lastly, this preface cannot be closed without a word of thanks to Mr. A. C Ghatak, the Superintendent, for his help in piloting the work through the Press.

H. C. R. C

ABBREVIATIONS

A. B.	After the Buddha
A. G. I.	Ancient Geography of India.
A. H. D.	Ancient History of the Deccan
A. I. H. T	Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.
A. I. U.	The Age of Imperial Unity (Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavana)
Ait. Br.	Aitareya Brāhmana
Alex.	Plutarch's Life of Alexander.
A N. M	Age of the Nandas and Mauryas · Pub. Motilal Banarasi Dass for the Bhāratīya Itihāsa Parishad).
Aṅg.	Aṅguttara Nikāya.
Ann. Bhand. Ins.	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Āpas. Śr. Sūtra	Āpastambīya Śrauta Sūtra
App.	Appendix.
Arch. Rep.	Archaeological Survey Report
A. R.	Annual Report
A. R. I	Aryan Rule in India.
A. S. I.	Archaeological Survey of India.
A. S. R. (Arch. Surv. Rep.).	Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India
A. S. W. I.	Archæological Survey of Western India.
A. V.	Atharva-Veda.
Baudh. Śr. Sūtra	Bodhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
Bau. Sūtra.	Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra.
Bhand. Com. Vol.	Bhandarkar Commemoration. Volume.
B. K. S.	Book of Kindred Sayings.
Bomb. Gaz.	Bombay Gazetteer.

Br. . . .	Brāhmaṇa.
Bṛih. S. . . .	Bṛihat Saṁhitā.
Bṛih. Up. .	Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad
Bud. Ind. . .	Buddhist India.
C. . . .	Central.
C. A. H. . .	Cambridge Ancient History
Cal. Rev. . .	Calcutta Review.
Camb. Ed. . .	Cambridge Edition.
Camb. Hist. (Ind.) . (C. H. I.)	Cambridge History of India (Vol. I).
Camb. Short Hist.	(The) Cambridge Shorter History of India.
Carm. Lec . .	Carmichael Lectures, 1918
Ch. . . Chap. .	Chapter
Chh. Up. . .	Chhāndogya Upanishad.
C. I. C A. I. . .	Catalogue of Indian Coins. Ancient India
C. I. I. Corpus. .	Corpus Inscription Indicarum
Com. Vol. .	Commemoration Volume
Cunn . .	Cunningham
D. .	Dīgha Nikāya.
Dialogues. . .	Dialogues of the Buddha.
D P. P. N. .	Dictionary of Pali Proper Names (Malalasekera).
D. K. A. .	Dynasties of the Kali Age.
D. U. . . .	Dacca University.
Ed. . .	Edition.
E. H. D. . .	Early History of the Dekkan
E. H. I. . .	Early History of India.
E. H. V. S.	Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect.
Ep. Ind. . . .	Epigraphia Indica
Gandhāra (Foucher) .	Notes on the Ancient Geography of Gandhāra.
Gaz. . . .	Gazetteer.

G. B. I. . . .	The Greeks in Bactria and India.
G. E. . . .	Gupta Era.
G. E. I. . . .	(The) Great Epic of India.
Gop. Br. . . .	Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.
G. O. S. . . .	Gaekwar Oriental Series.
Greeks. . . .	The Greeks in Bactria and India.
Hariv. . . .	Harivaṁśa.
H. and F. . . .	Hamilton and Falconer's Translation of Strabo's Geography.
H. C. I. P. . .	The History and Culture of the Indian People (Bhāratīva Vidyā Bhavana).
H. F. A. I. C. . .	History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon.
Hist. N. E. Ind. .	History of North Eastern India.
Hist. Sans Lit. .	(A) History of Sanskrit Literature.
H. O. S. . .	Harvard Oriental Series.
Hyd. Hist. Cong .	Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Hyderabad (1941).
I. H. Q. . .	Indian Historical Quarterly.
Int. Ant. (I. A.) .	Indian Antiquarv.
Ind. Lit . . .	History of Indian Literature.
Imp. Gaz. . .	Imperial Gazetteer.
Inv. Alex. . .	Invasion of Alexander.
Ins. . . .	Inscriptions.
J.	Jātaka.
J. A. (Journ. As.) .	Journal Asiatique.
J. A. H. S. . .	Journal of the Andhra Historical Society.
J. A. O. S. . .	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J. A. S. B. . .	Journal and Proceeding of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J. B. Br. R. A. S. .	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

J. B. O. R. S.	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
J. I. H.	Journal of Indian History.
J. N. S. I.	Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.
J. R. A. S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Great Britain).
J. R. N. S.	Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society and the Numismatic Chronicle.
J. U. P. H. S.	Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society.
Kaush. Up.	Kaushītaki Upanishad.
Kaut.	Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, Mysore, 1919.
Kishk.	Kishkindhyā Kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa.
Life	(The) Life of Hiuen Tsang.
M.	Majjhima Nikāya
M. A. S. I.	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.
Mat.	Matsya Purāṇa.
Meb. Hind. Ind.	Mahābhārata.
Mbh.	Medieval Hindu India.
Mod. Rev.	Modern Review.
M. R.	Minor Rock Edicts.
N.	Nikāya.
N. H. I. P.	The New History of the Indian People (Vol. VI).
N. Ins.	(A) List of Inscriptions of North India.
Num. Chron.	Numismatic Chronicle.
O. S. (Penzer)	The Ocean of Story.
P.	Purāṇa.
P. A. O. S.	Proceedings of the American Oriental Society.
Pratijñā	Pratijñā Yaugandharāyana.

Pro Or. Conf.	. Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference.
Pt. (Pat.) . .	. Patañjali.
Rām. . .	. Rāmāyaṇa.
R. D. B.	. Rakhal Das Banerji
R. P. V. U. .	. Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads
R. V.	. Ṛig-Veda.
Śaṅkh. Śr. Sūtra	Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra
Sans. Lit. .	. Sanskrit Literature.
Śanti. . .	. Śāntiparva of the Mahābhārata.
Sat. Br .	. Śāntipatha Brāhmaṇa.
S. B. E	. Sacred Books of the East.
Ś. E. .	. Śaka Era.
Sec.	. Section.
S. I. I .	. South Indian Inscriptions.
S. Ins	(A) List of Inscriptions of Southern India.
S. P. Patrika	. Vangīya Sāhitya-Parishat Patrikā
Svapna. .	. Svapnavāsavadatta.
Tr	Translation.
Up. Br	. Upanishad Brāhmana
V.	Veda.
Vāj. Sam .	. Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā
Ved. Ind	Vedic Index.
Vish. .	. Vishṇu Purāṇa
Vizag. Dist. Gaz	Vizagapatam District Gazetteer
Vogel Volume	A Volume of Oriental Studies presented to Jean Philippe Vogel (1947).
Z. D. M. G.	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft.

CONTENTS

PART I

FROM THE ACCESSION OF PARIKSHIT TO THE CORONATION OF BIMBISARA

PAGE

CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II—KURUS AND VIDEHAS

CHAPTER III—MAHAJANAPADAS AND KINGSHIP

PART II

FROM THE CORONATION OF BIMBISARA TO THE EXTINCTION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY

CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION

[1] In this work "India" means usually the entire territory known by that name up to August 15, 1947.

APPENDICES, INDEXES ETC.

MAPS

Political History of Ancient India

PART I

From the Accession of Parikshit to the Coronation of Bimbisāra

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

SECTION I. FOREWORD

No Thucydides or Tacitus has left for posterity a genuine history of Ancient India. But the patient investigations of numerous scholars and archæologists have opened up rich stores of material for the reconstruction of the ancient history of our country. The first notable attempt to "sort and arrange the accumulated and ever-growing stores of knowledge" was made by Dr. Vincent Smith. But the excellent historian, failing to find sober history in bardic tales, ignored the period immediately succeeding "the famous war waged on the banks of the Jumna, between the sons of Kuru and the sons of Pāṇḍu," and took as his starting point the middle of the seventh century B.C. The aim of the present writer has been to sketch in outline the dynastic history of Ancient India including the neglected period. He takes as his starting point the accession of Parikshit which, according to Epic and Purāṇic tradition, took place shortly after the Bhārata War.

Valuable information regarding the Pārikshita and the post-Pārikshita periods has been given by eminent scholars like Weber, Lassen, Eggeling, Caland, Oldenberg, Jacobi, Hopkins, Macdonell, Keith, Rhys Davids, Fick,

Pargiter, Bhandarkar and others. But the attempt to frame an outline of political history from Parikshit to Bimbisāra out of materials supplied by Brāhmaṇic as well as non-Brāhmaṇic literature is, I believe, made for the first time in the following pages.

SECTION II. SOURCES

No inscription or coin has unfortunately been discovered which can be referred, with any amount of certainty, to the post-Pārikshita-pre-Bimbisārian period. The South Indian plates purporting to belong to the reign of Janamejaya[1] have been proved to be spurious. Our chief reliance must, therefore, be placed upon literary evidence. Unfortunately this evidence is, in the main, Indian, and is not supplemented to any considerable extent by those foreign notices which have "done more than any archæological discovery to render possible the remarkable resuscitation" of the history of the post-Bimbisārian epoch. The discoveries at Mahenjo-Daro and Harappa no doubt constitute a welcome addition to the purely literary evidence regarding the ancient history of India. But the civilisation disclosed is possibly that of Sauvīra or Sovīra (Sophir, Ophir)[2] in the pre-Pārikshita period. And the monuments exhumed "offer little direct contribution to the materials for political history," particularly of the *Madhya-deśa* or the Upper Ganges valley.

Indian literature useful for the purpose of the historian of the post-Pārikshita-pre Bimbisārian age may be divided into five classes, *viz.* :—

I. Brāhmaṇical literature of the post-Pārikshita-pre-Bimbisārian period. This class of literature naturally contributes the most valuable information regarding the history of the earliest dynasties and comprises:

(*a*) The last book of the *Atharva Veda*.

[1] *Ep. Ind.*, VII, App. pp. 162-63 ; *IA* , III. 268 ; IV. 333
[2] Cf. *IA*., XIII. 228 ; I. Kings, 9, 28 ; 10, 11,

(*b*) *The Aitareya, Śatapatha, Pañchaviṁśa* and other ancient *Brāhmaṇas*.[1]

(*c*) The major part of the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*, the *Chhāndogya* and other classical *Upanishads*.

That these works belong to the post-Pārikshita period is proved by repeated references to Parikshit, to his son Janamejaya, to Janamejaya's successor Abhipratārin, and to Janaka of Videha at whose court the fate of the Pārikshitas was discussed by the assembled sages. That these works are in the main pre-Buddhistic and, therefore, pre Bimbisārian, has been proved by competent critics like Dr. Rājendralāl Mitra,[2] Professor Macdonell[3] and others.

II. The second class comprises Brāhmaṇical works to which no definite date can be assigned, but large portions of which, in the opinion of scholars, belong to the post-Bimbisārian period. To this class belong the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. The present *Rāmāyaṇa* consists of 24,000 *ślokas* or verses.[4] But even in the first or second century A.D. the epic seems to have contained only 12,000 *ślokas*[5] as the evidence of the Buddhist *Mahāvibhāshā*, a commentary on the *Jñānaprasthāna* of Kātyāyanīputra, suggests. It not only mentions Buddha Tathāgata,[6] but distinctly refers to the struggles of the Hindus with mixed hordes of Yavanas (Greeks) and Śakas (Scythians), *Śakān Yavana-Miśritān*.[7] In the *Kishkindhyā Kāṇḍa*,[8] Sugriva

[1] Of special importance are the *gāthās* or songs in the thirteenth *kānda* of the *Śat. Br.* and the eighth *pañchikā* of the *Aitareya*.

[2] Translation of the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*, pp. 23-24.

[3] *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 189, 202-03, 226.

[4] I. 4. 2—*Chaturviṁśa-sahasrāṇi ślokānām uktavān rishih.*

[5] *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 99 ff. *Cf.* Bunyiu Nanjio's *Catalogue*, No. 1263.

[6] II. 109. 34.

[7] I. 54. 21.

[8] IV. 43. 11-12. Note also the references to Vaijayantapura in the Deccan (II. 9. 12), the Drāviḍas (*ibid.*, 10. 37), Malaya and Darddūra (*ibid.*, 91. 24) Murachīpattana (Muziris, Cranganore, IV. 42. 3), practices of the people of the Deccan (II. 93. 13), "the seven flourishing realms" of Yavadvīpa (Java), Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra) in IV. 40. 30, and Karkaṭaka lagna (II. 15. 3).

places the country of the Yavanas and the cities of the Śakas between the country of the Kurus and the Madras, and the Himālayas. This shows that the Græco-Scythians at that time occupied parts of the Pañjāb. The *Laṅkā Kāṇḍa*[1] apparently refers to the Purāṇic episode of the uplifting of Mount Mandara, or of Govardhana, *Parigṛihya giriṁ dorbhyāṁ vapur Vishnor viḍambayan.*[2]

As regards the present *Mahabhārata*, Hopkins says.[3] "Buddhist supremacy already decadent is implied by passages which allude contemptuously to the eḍūkas or Buddhistic monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. Thus in III. 190. 65 'They will revere eḍūkas, they will neglect the gods'; *ib.* 67 'the earth shall be piled with eḍūkas, not adorned with godhouses.' With such expressions may be compared the thoroughly Buddhistic epithet, Cāturmahārājika in XII. 339. 40 and Buddhistic philosophy as expounded in the same book."

"The Greeks are described as a western people and their overthrow is alluded to......The Romans, Romakas, are mentioned but once, in a formal list of all possible peoples, II. 51. 17, and stand thus in marked contrast to Greeks and Persians, Pahlavas, who are mentioned very often......The distinct prophecy that 'Scythians, Greeks and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come' which occurs in III. 188. 35 is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away."

The *Ādiparva*[4] refers to king Aśoka who is represented as an incarnation of a *Mahāsura* or great demon,[5]

[1] 69. 32; cf *Matsya*, 249. 53; *Bhāgavata*, X. 25, *Mbh.*, III. 101. 15.

[2] For some other Purāṇic allusions see *Calcutta Review*, March, 1922, pp. 500-02. For references to *suttee* see Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, 13. 173. For 'empire' *Rām.* II. 10. 36.

[3] *The Great Epic of India*, pp. 391-93.

[4] I. 67. 13-14. *Cf* also XII. 5. 7 where Aśoka is mentioned with Śatadhanvan.

[5] It is interesting to note in this connection that in the *Devīmāhātmya* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (88. 5) *Maurya* is the name of a class of *Asuras* or demons:—

Kālakā Daurhṛitā Mauryāḥ Kālakeyāstathāsurāḥ
yuddhāya sajjā niryāntu ājñayā tvaritā mama

and is described as *mahāvīryo'parājitaḥ*, of great prowess and invincible. We have also a reference[1] to a Greek overlord, *Yavanādhipaḥ* of Sauvīra and his compatriot Dattāmitra (Demetrios?). The *Śāntiparva* presupposes the inclusion of the city of Mālinī, in the land of the Aṅgas, within the realm of Magadha.[2] It mentions Yāska, the author of the *Nirukta*,[3] Vārshagaṇya,[4] the Sāṁkhya philosopher who probably flourished in the fourth or fifth century after Christ[5] and Kāmandaka,[6] the authority, on *Dharma* (sacred law) and *Artha* (polity) who is probably to be identified with the famous disciple of Kauṭilya.

The eighteen *Purāṇas* were certainly known to Alberuni[7] (A.D. 1000), Rājaśekhara (A.D. 900), and the latest compiler of the *Mahābhārata* who flourished before A.D. 500. Some of the Purāṇic chronicles are mentioned by Bāṇa (A.D. 600) and earlier writers. But the extant texts which contain lists of kings of the *Kali Age* cannot be placed earlier than the third or fourth century A.D.,

"Let the Kālaka, the Dauhṛita, the *Maurya* and the Kālakeya *Asuras*, hastening at my command, march forth ready for battle."

Note also the expression *suradvishām* (of the enemies of the gods, i.e., *Asuras*) used by the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (1. 3. 24) in reference to people "deluded", by the Buddha.

[1] *Mbh.*, I. 139. 21-23.

[2] 5. 1-6.

[3] 342. 73

[4] 318. 59.

[5] *J.R.A.S.*, 1905, pp. 47-51; Keith, *Sāṁkhya System*, pp. 62, 63, 69.

[6] *Śānti*, 123. 11.

[7] *Cf.* Alberuni, Ch. XII, *Prachaṇḍa-Pāṇḍava*, ed. by Carl Cappeller, p. 5 (*ashṭādaśa-purāṇa-sāra-saṁgraha-kārin*); *Mbh.*, XVIII. 6. 97; *Harshacharita*, III (p. 86 of Parab's ed., 1918), *Pavamāna-prokta Purāṇa*, i.e., *Vāyu Purāṇa* ; Cf. *Sakala-purāṇa-rājarshi-charitābhijñāḥ* (HI. 87) and *Hareriva Vṛishavirodhīni Bālacharitāni* (II. 77); *E.H.V.S.* second ed., *pp.* 17, 70, 150. The fact that the collection of the essence (*sāra-saṁgraha*) of *all* the eighteen *Purāṇas is attributed* to a very ancient sage by Rājaśekhara proves that the Purāṇas themselves were believed by him to have been composed long before the ninth century A.D. The existence of some of the texts in the sixth century A.D. is hinted at by the Nerūr inscription of Maṅgaleśa (*IA.*, VII. 161—*Mānava-Purāṇa-Rāmāyaṇa-Bhāratetihāsa-kuśalah . . . Vallabhaḥ*, i.e., Pulikeśī I). The reference in the *Matsya Purāṇa*, which is regarded as one of the earliest among the Purāṇic works, to week days (70, 46 ; 56 ; 72, 27, etc. is of value in determining the upper limit.

because they refer to the so-called Andhra kings and even to the post-Andhras.

It is clear from what has been stated above that the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, in their present shape, are late works which are no better suited to serve as the foundation of the history of the pre-Bimbisārian age than are the tales of the *Mahāvaṁśa* and the *Aśokāvadāna* adapted to form the bases of chronicles of the doings of the great Mauryas. At the same time we shall not be justified in rejecting their evidence wholesale because much of it is undoubtedly old and valuable. The warning to handle critically, which Dr. Smith considered necessary with regard to the Pali chronicles of Ceylon, is also applicable to the Sanskrit Epics and *Purāṇas*.

In a recent work Dr. Keith shows scepticism about the historical value of these texts, and wonders at the "naïve credulity" of those who believe in the historicity of any event not explicitly mentioned in the Vedas, *e.g.*, "a great Bhāratan war". It cannot be denied that the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, in their present shape, contain a good deal of what is untrustworthy; but it has been rightly said that "It is absurd to suppose that fiction completely ousted the truth." The epigraphic or numismatic records of the *Śātavāhanas*, *Ābhīras*, *Vākāṭakas*, *Nāgas*, *Guptas* and many other dynasties fully bear out the observation of Dr. Smith that "modern European writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the *Purāṇic* lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition." As to the "great *Bhārata* war" we have indeed no epigraphic corroboration, because contemporary inscriptions are lacking. But, as will be pointed out in a subsequent chapter, Vedic literature contains many hints that the story of the great conflict is not wholly fictitious. Many of the figures in the *Kurukshetra* story, *e.g.*, Bālhika Prātipeya[1] (Balhika Prātipīya), Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya, Kṛishṇa, Devakī-

[1] *Mbh.*, V. 23. 9.

putra and perhaps Śikhaṇḍin Yājñasena, are mentioned in some of the early Vedic texts,[1] and we have a distinct allusion in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* to the unfriendly feeling between the first of these, a prince of the Kurus, and the Sṛiñjayas.[2] It will be remembered that the great war described in the epic often takes the shape of a trial of strength between these two peoples (*Kurūṇāṁ Sṛiñjayānāṁ cha jigīshūṇāṁ parasparam*).[3] In the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa*[4] Kurus reproach the Dālbhyas, a clan closely connected with the Pañchālas who appear to have been among the principal antagonists of the Kuru leaders in the Bhārata War. The *Chhāndogya Upanishad*, as is well-known, contains a *gāthā* which eulogises the mare that comes to the rescue of the Kurus. Battle-songs describing the struggle of the Kurus against the Sṛiñjayas and associate tribes or clans must have been current at least as early as the fifth century B.C., because Vaiśampāyana and his version of the *Mahābhārata* are well-known to Āśvalāyana and Pāṇini. If, as suggested by Vedic evidence discussed in the following pages, the "great *Bhāratan* war" really took place in or about the ninth century B.C., the broad outlines of the story about the conflict dating from a period not later than the fifth century B.C., cannot be dismissed as wholly unworthy of credence.

Pargiter, unlike Keith, is inclined to give more weight to Purāṇic tradition than to Vedic evidence, and his conclusions have apparently been accepted by Dr. Barnett.[5] It has eloquently been urged by the former[6] that Vedic literature "lacks the historical sense" and "is not always to be trusted." But do the *Purāṇas* which represent Śākya as one individual, include Abhimanyu and Siddhārtha in lists of kings, make

[1] *Cf.* also Arjuna identified with Indra in the *Śat. Br.*, V. 4. 3. 7 and Pārtha in the *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, XII. 10 (*Vedic Index*, I. 522).

[2] *Vedic Index*, II, p. 63. *Śat. Br.*, XII, 9. 3.

[3] *Mbh.*, VI. 45. 2.

[4] I. 38. 1 (xii, 4).

[5] *Calcutta Review*, Feb., 1924, p. 249.

[6] *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 9 ff.

Prasenajit the immediate lineal successor of Rāhula, place Pradyota several generations before Bimbisāra, dismiss Aśoka with one sentence, make no mention of the dynastic name Śātavāhana, and omit from the list of the so-called "Andhras," princes like Siri-Kubha (Śrī-Kumbha) Śātakaṇi whose existence is proved by the incontestable evidence of coins,[1] possess the historical sense in a remarkable degree, and are "always to be trusted"? Pargiter himself, not unoften, rejects Epic and Purāṇic evidence[2] when it is opposed to certain theories. In this connection it will not be quite out of place to quote the following observations of Mr. V. Gordon Childe.[3] "The *Kṣatriya* tradition (*i.e.*, Epic and Purāṇic tradition)......is hardly an unpolluted source of history. The orthodox view is not really based on the priestly tradition, as embodied in epexegetical works, but rather on the internal evidence of the Veda itself. The latter carries conviction precisely because the historical and geographical references in the hymns are introduced only incidentally and in a thoroughly ingenuous manner...The same cannot be said of *Kṣatriya* tradition, which in its recorded form dates from an age (perhaps as late as 200 A.D.) when myth-making had had many centuries to work in, and which might serve dynastic ends." Priority of date and comparative freedom from textual corruption are two strong points in favour of Vedic literature.

III. The third class of literature comprises Brāhmaṇical works of the post-Bimbisārian period to which a date in a definite epoch may be assigned, *e.g.*, the *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* assignable to the period 249 B. C. to c.100 A.D.,[4] the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali between c.150 B.C. and 100 A.D.,[5] etc. The value of these impor-

[1] Mirashi in *the Journal of the Numismatic Society of India*, Vol. II.

[2] Cf. *A.I.H.T.*, pp. 173, n. 1; 299, n. 7.

[3] *The Aryans*, p. 32.

[4] The work was known not only to Bāṇa, the author of the *Kādambarī* who flourished in the seventh century A.D., but to the *Nandisūtra* and *Paiṇṇas*

[5] For recent discussions about the date of Patañjali see *Indian Culture*, III. 1 ff., *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Third Session, pp. 510-11.

tant works can hardly be overestimated. They form "sheet anchors in the troubled sea of Indian chronology." Their evidence with regard to the pre-Bimbisārian age is certainly inferior to that of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads*, but the very fact that such information as

of the Jainas which may have existed in the early centuries A.D. and probably also to the *Nyāya-Bhāshya* of Vātsyāyana, which is criticised by Dignāga and perhaps by Vasubandhu too (I.A., 1915, p. 82, 1918, p. 103). According to some scholars the *Arthaśāstra* literature is later than the *Dharmaśāstras*, and dates only from about the third century A.D. But the prevalence of the study of *Arthavidyā* in a much earlier epoch is proved by the **Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I and the existence of treatises on *Arthaśāstra*** is rendered probable by the mention of technical terms like "*Praṇaya*," "*Vishṭi*," etc. It is interesting to note that the *Kauṭilīya*, which purports to be a compendium of pre-existing *Arthaśāstras*, does not quote the views of previous *Āchāryas* or teachers in the chapter on "*Praṇaya*" (Bk. V, Ch. 2). It is, therefore, not unlikely that Rudradāman I, who claims to have studied the *Arthavidyā* learnt the use of the term from the *Kauṭilīya* itself and not from a pre-Kauṭilyan treatise. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Junāgaḍh epigraphs show a special acquaintance with the *Arthaśāstra* literature. The Junāgaḍh Inscription of Skanda Gupta, for instance, refers to the testing of officials by *upadhās—sarv-opadhābhiś cha viśuddhabuddhiḥ*, "possessed of a mind that (has been tried and) is (found to be) pure by all the tests of honesty." The verse

Nyāy-ārjane-rthasya cha kaḥ samarthaḥ
syād-arjitasy-āpy-atha rakshaṇe cha
gopāyitasy-āpi cha vṛiddhi-hetau
Vṛiddhasya pātra-pratipādanāya

"Who is capable both in the lawful acquisition of wealth, and also in the preservation of it, when acquired, and further in causing the increase of it, when protected, (and able) to dispense it on worthy objects, when it has been increased" (Fleet),

reminds us of *Kauṭ.*, 1. 1—

Daṇḍanītiḥ; alabdha-lābhārthā labdha-parirakshaṇī, rakshita-vivardhanī vṛiddhasya tīrtheshu pratipādanī cha.

"The science of government, it is a means to make acquisitions, to preserve what is acquired, to increase what is protected and to distribute among the worthy what has been increased."

Johnston (J.R.A.S., 1929, 1 January, p. 77 ff.) points out that the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* is not separated by a great interval from Aśvaghosha, and is distinctly earlier than the *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra (who flourished before 434 A.D. Winternitz, *Ind. Lit.*, Vol. II, 276). An early date is also suggested by the absence of any reference to the Denarius in Book II, Chs. 12 and 19. But the mention of *Chīnabhūmi* and *Chīnapaṭṭa* in Bk. II, Ch. 11, precludes the possibility of a date earlier than the middle of the third century B.C. The reference must be to the great country of the Far East (*Cf.* "China which produces silk," Kosmas Indikopleustes, McCrindle's *Ancient India*, p. 162), and not to any obscure tribe on the outskirts of India. China silk

they contain, comes from persons assignable to a known epoch, makes it more valuable than the Epic and Purāṇic tradition, the antiquity and authenticity of which can always be called in question.

IV. To the fourth class belong the Buddhist *Suttas*, *Vinaya* texts and the *Jātakas*. Several works of the Buddhist canon are noticed in votive inscriptions at Bharhut and Sāñchī assigned to the second and first centuries B. C. Many of the reliefs found on the railings and gateways of *Stūpas* of the age depict stories taken from the *Jātakas*. The texts of the Pali canon are said to have been committed to writing in the first century B.C. They furnish a good deal of useful information regarding the period which immediately preceded the accession of Bimbisāra. They have also the merit of preserving Buddhist versions of ancient stories, and vouchsafe light when the light from Brāhmaṇical sources begins to fail.

V. To the fifth class belong the sacred texts of the Jainas. Some of the works may go back to a period earlier than the second century A.D. But the canon as a whole was probably reduced to writing in the fifth or sixth century A.D.[1] It gives interesting information regarding many kings who lived during the pre-Bimbisārian Age. But its comparatively late date makes its evidence not always reliable.

looms large in the pages of classical Sanskrit writers. The great silk-producing country (as well as Kambu, *Kauṭ.*, II. 13) clearly lay outside the horizon of the early Mauryas. The name 'Chīna' applied to the famous land can hardly be anterior to the first emperor of the Ch'in Dynasty (249-210 B.C., Mogi and Redman, *The Problem of the Far East*, p. 15). A post-Chandraguptan date for the *Arthaśāstra* is also suggested by (*a*) the reference to parapets of brick instead of wooden ramparts (II. 3), in connection with the royal seat, and (*b*) the use of Sanskrit at the Secretariat (II. 10). The imperial title *Chakravarti* (IX. 1) is not met with in inscriptions before Khāravela. The official designations *Samāhartṛi* and *Sannidhātṛi* find mention in epigraphs of a still later age.

[1] Jacobi, *Pariśishṭa parvan*, p. vii; S.B.E., Vol. XXII, p. xxxvii; XLV, p. xl. *Cf.* Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Eng. trans., Vol. II, p. 432.

CHAPTER II. KURUS AND VIDEHAS

SECTION I. THE AGE OF THE PARIKSHITAS

Janaḥ sa bhadramedhati
rāshṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitaḥ
—*Atharva Veda.*

We have taken as our starting point the **reign of Parikshit** whose accession, according to tradition, took place shortly after the *Bhārata* War.

Was there really a king named Parikshit? True, he is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. But the mere mention of a king in this kind of literature is no sure proof of his historical existence unless we have corroborative evidence from external sources.

Parikshit appears in a famous laud of the Twentieth Book of the *Atharva Veda Saṁhitā*[1] as a king of the Kurus (*Kauravya*) whose kingdom (*rāshṭra*) flowed with milk and honey. The passage runs as follows:—

"*Rājño viśvajanînasya yo devo martyām ati*
vaiśvānarasya sushṭutim ā sunotā Parikshitaḥ
parichchhinnaḥ kshemamakarot tama āsanamācharan
kulāyan kriṇvan Kauravyaḥ patirvadati jāyayā
katarat ta ā harāṇi dadhi manthāṁ pari śrutam
jāyāḥ patiṁ vi prichchhati rāshṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitaḥ
abhîvasvaḥ pra jihîte yavaḥ pakvaḥ patho bilam
janaḥ sa bhadramedhati rāshṭre rājñaḥ Parikshitaḥ."

"Listen ye to the high praise of the king who rules over all peoples, the god who is above mortals, who is thought of by all men,[2] of Parikshit! Parikshit has

[1] *A.V.*, XX. 127, 7. 10.
[2] For the meaning of *Vaiśvānara*, see *Bṛihaddevatā*, II. 66.

produced for us a secure dwelling when he, the most excellent one, went to his seat. (Thus) the husband in Kuru land, when he founds his household, converses with his wife.

"What may I bring to thee, curds, stirred drink or liquor? (Thus) the wife asks her husband in the kingdom of king Parikshit.

"Like light the ripe barley runs over beyond the mouth (of the vessels). The people thrive merrily in the kingdom of king Parikshit."[1]

Roth and Bloomfield regard Parikshit in the *Atharva Veda* as a divine being. But Zimmer and Oldenberg recognize him as a human king, a view supported by the fact that in the *Aitareya* and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas* the famous king Janamejaya bears the patronymic *Pārikshita* (son of Parikshit). The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*,[2] for example, informs us that the priest Tura Kāvasheya "anointed Janamejaya Pārikshita with the great anointing of Indra":

"Etena ha vā Aindreṇa mahābhishekeṇa Turaḥ Kāvasheyo Janamejayaṁ Pārikshitam abhishishecha."

Referring to king Parikshit, Macdonell and Keith observe[3]: "The epic makes him grandfather of Pratiśravas and great-grandfather of Pratīpa." Now, the epic and the *Purāṇas* have really two Parikshits. Regarding the parentage of one there is no unanimity. He is variously represented as the son of Avīkshit, Anaśvā, or Kuru, and is further mentioned as an ancestor of Pratiśravas and Pratīpa. The other Parikshit was a descendant of Pratīpa and, according to a unanimous tradition, a son of Abhimanyu.[4] We shall call the former Parikshit I, and the latter Parikshit II. Was Parikshit I of the Epic and the *Purāṇas* identical with the Vedic Parikshit

[1] Bloomfield, *Atharva Veda*, pp 197-98, with slight emendations.

[2] VIII. 21.

[3] *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 494.

[4] *Mahābhārata*, Ādiparva, 54, 52 and 95, 41. Regarding Parikshit I, the *Matsya Purāṇa* says, 50, 23:

Kurostu dayitāḥ putrāḥ Sudhanvā Jahnureva cha
Parikshichcha mahātejāḥ pravaraś chārimardanaḥ.

as suggested by the authors of the *Vedic Index*? In support of this view it may be urged that Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka, priest of Janamejaya, son of the Vedic Parikshit, according to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,[1] is represented in several *Purāṇas*[2] as chaplain of the son of Parikshit I who came *before* the Bhārata heroes. Indrota's son Dṛiti was a contemporary of Abhipratārin Kākshaseni,[3] "son of Kakshasena," and the name of Kakshasena actually appears among the sons of Parikshit I in a genealogical list of the *Mahābhārata*.[4] Further, like the Vedic Parikshit, Parikshit I had, according to a Purāṇic passage, four sons, *viz*., Janamejaya, Śrutasena, Ugrasena, and Bhīmasena,[5] and the eldest son had a quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas.

There are, however, other facts which point to an opposite conclusion. The Vedic Parikshit receives in the *Atharvan* laud the epithet *rājā viśvajanīna* (universal king) and is called "a *deva* (god) who is above mortals." In his days the designation *Kauravya* had ceased to be a mere royal patronymic and was applied to ordinary citizens in Kuru land. Kuru had become the eponymous ancestor of the entire race. And lastly, the people throve merrily (*janaḥ sa bhadramedhati*) in his realm. These particulars hardly apply to the shadowy Parikshit I of Epic and Purāṇic lists who is said to have been very near in time to Kuru himself.[6] On the other hand the Vedic laud corresponds wonderfully, both in content and phraseology with the famous *ākhyāna* (story) of Parikshit II, son of Abhimanyu, narrated in Chapters 16 to 18 of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. We are told that this Parikshit undertook a *digvijaya*, conquest of all the quarters, in the

[1] *Vedic Index*, i. 78.
[2] Pargiter, AIHT., 114.
[3] *Vedic Index*, i, 373.
[4] *Mbh*., I. 94. 54.
[5] *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, iv. 20. 1
[6] In the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 93. 21 and the *Harivaṁśa*, XXX. 9, Parikshit I seems to be identified with Kuru himself as his son (*Pārikshita*) is called *Kuroḥ putraḥ*, son of Kuru,

course of which he subjugated all the sub-continents (*varshāṇi*). He is called *the supreme deva* who is not to be regarded as the equal of ordinary men (*na vai nribhir-naradevaṁ parākhyaṁ saṁmātum arhasi*). He is further styled *samrāṭ* (emperor) and under his protection people thrive and have nothing to fear (*vindanti bhadrāṇyakuto-bhayāḥ prajāḥ*).

Proof of the **identity of this Parikshit** (son of Abhimanyu) with his Vedic namesake is also furnished by a later passage of the same *Purāṇa*[1] which mentions Tura Kāvasheya as the priest of *his* son Janamejaya:

Kāvasheyaṁ purodhāya Turaṁ turagamedharāṭ
Samantāt prithivīṁ sarvāṁ jitvā yakshyati chādhvaraiḥ

It will be remembered that the same sage appears as the priest of Janamejaya Pārikshita in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.*

The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* is no doubt a late work. But its evidence does not stand alone. This will be made clear by an examination of the names of the sons of Parikshit given in the Vedic texts and the Epic respectively. The Vedic Parikshit, we are told, had four sons namely, Janamejaya, Ugrasena, Bhīmasena and Śrutasena.[2] The Epic Parikshit I, on the other hand, had only one son (Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 95, verse 42 of the *Ādiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*, and seven sons (Janamejaya, Kakshasena, Ugrasena, Chitrasena, Indrasena, Sushena and Bhīmasena) according to Chapter 94, verses 54-55, and among these the name of *Śrutasena* does not occur. Even Janamejaya is omitted in Chapter 95 and in the *Java text*.[3] There is no king of that name immediately after Parikshit I, also in the Kuru-Pāṇḍu genealogy given in the Chellur or Cocanada grant of Vīrachoḍa.[4] The Epic poet and the writer of the Choḍa inscription, which is much older than many

[1] Book IX. Ch. 22, Verses 25-37.
[2] *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 520
[3] J.R.A.S., 1913, p. 6.
[4] Hultzsch, S.I I., Vol. I, p. 57.

extent manuscripts of the *Mahābhārata,* therefore, were not quite sure as to whether this Parikshit (I) was the father of Janamejaya and *Śrutasena.* On the other hand, according to the unanimous testimony of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas,* Parikshit II had undoubtedly a son named Janamejaya who succeeded him on the throne. Thus the *Mahābhārata,* referring to Parikshit II, the son of Abhimanyu, says.[1]

Parikshit khalu Mādravatīṁ nāmopayeme, tvanmātaram. Tasyāṁ bhavān Janamejayaḥ. "Parikshit married Mādravatī, your mother, and she gave birth to you, Janamejaya."

The *Matsya Purāṇa*[2] informs us that

"Abhimanyoḥ Parikshittu putraḥ parapurañjayaḥ
Janamejayaḥ Parikshitaḥ putraḥ paramadhārmikaḥ."

"Abhimanyu's son was Parikshit, the conqueror of his enemy's city. Parikshit's son was Janamejaya who was very righteous."

This Janamejaya had three brothers, namely, Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena:—*"Janamejayaḥ Pārikshitaḥ saha bhrātṛbhiḥ Kurukshetre dīrgha-satram upāste; tasya bhrātarastrayaḥ Śrutasena Ugraseno Bhīmasena iti."*[3]

"Janamejaya, son of Parikshit, with his brothers, was attending a long sacrifice of Kurukshetra. His brothers were three, namely,—Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena."

Particulars regarding the son and successor of the Vedic Parikshit agree well with what we know of the son and successor of the Epic and the Purāṇic Parikshit II. Janamejaya, the son of the Vedic Parikshit, is mentioned

[1] I. 95. 85.
[2] 50, 57.
[3] *Mbh.*, 1. 3. 1. In translating Epic passages use has been made of the renderings of Ray and Dutt. See also Purāṇic texts cited by Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 4n[4]. The view that Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena were *sons* of Janamejaya (Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 113 f.) is clearly opposed to the evidence of the Epic and several *Purāṇas*, as well as that of Harisvāmin. Speaking about Parikshit, son of Abhimanyu, the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, for example, says (iv. 21. 1): *"Yo'yaṁ sāmpratam avanipatiḥ tasyāpi Janamejaya-Śrutasena-Ugrasena-Bhīmasenaḥ putrās chatvāro bhavishyanti."*

in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* as a performer of the *Aśvamedha* or horse-sacrifice. The priest who performed the famous rite for him was Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka. On the other hand, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, which also mentions his *Aśvamedha*, names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. The statements of the *Śatapatha*, and *Aitareya Brāhmaṇas* are apparently conflicting, and can be reconciled if we surmise that either we are dealing with *two* different kings of the same name and parentage *or* the *same* Janamejaya performed two horse-sacrifices. Which Janamejaya actually did so? Curiously enough the *Purāṇas* give the information which is needed. The *Matsya Purāṇa* speaking of Janamejaya, the grandson of Abhimanyu, and the son of Parikshit II, says:

Dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya mahāvājasaneyakaḥ
pravartayitvā taṁ sarvaṁ ṛshiṁ Vājasaneyakam
vivāde Brāhmaṇaiḥ sārddham abhiśapto vanaṁ yayau.[1]

The quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas, alluded to in the last line, is also mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.*[2] According to that text Janamejaya's priestly opponents were the Kaśyapas. That designation hardly applies to the Gārgyas who quarrelled with the son of *Parikshit I*[3] because the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[4] includes them in the Aṅgiras group. On the other hand Vaiśampāyana, who led the opponents of the son of *Parikshit II*, was undoubtedly a Kaśyapa.[5]

Parikshit II has thus a better claim than Parikshit I to be regarded as identical with the Vedic Parikshit. It is, however, possible that Parikshit I and Parikshit II represent a bardic duplication of the same original individual regarding whose exact place in the Kuru genealogy no unanimous tradition had survived. The fact that not only the name Parikshit, but names of

[1] 50, 63-64. *Cf.* N. K Siddhanta, *The Heroic Age of India*, p. 42
[2] VII. 27
[3] Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, 114; *Vāyu*, 93, 22-25.
[4] Vol. III. pp. 431 ff.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 449.

most of the sons (in the *Vishṇu* and *Brahma Purāṇas*[1] the names of all the sons) are common to both, points to the same conclusion. In the case of the son and successor of *each* of the two Parikshits we have a strikingly similar story of quarrel with the Brāhmaṇas.[2] It will further be remembered that while Tura Kāvasheya is mentioned in the Purāṇic literature as a *Purohita* of the son of Parikshit II, Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka is represented as the priest of the son of Parikshit I. But it is clear from the Vedic texts that both the royal chaplains served the *same* king who was *separated by five or six generations* from Janaka, the contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi, Yājñavalkya and Somaśushma. Doubts may thus be legitimately entertained about the existence of *two* Parikshits each of whom had sons and successors with identical names, the heroes of tales of a similar character. The probability is that there was really only *one* Parikshit in the Kuru royal family, father of the patron of *both* Tura and Indrota.

Did he flourish *before* or *after* the Bhārata War? The necessity felt for offering an explanation of the name Parikshit given to Abhimanyu's son at the end of the Bhārata War, and the explanation itself, probably suggest that the tradition of an earlier Kuru king with the name of Parikshit had not yet come into existence when the tenth book of the *Mahābhārata* was written.[3] Parikshit I was possibly invented by genealogists to account for such anachronisms as the mention of *Indrota-Pārikshita-saṁvāda* as an old story by Bhīshma in the twelfth book (Chapter 151). The wide divergence of opinion in regard to the name of the father of the so-called Parikshit I, and his position in the list, is also to be noted

[1] *Vishṇu*, IV. 20. 1; 21. 1; *Brahma*, XIII, 109.

[2] *Vāyu*, 93, 22-25; *Matsya*, 50, 63-64, etc

[3] *Mbh.*, X. 16. 3.

"While the Kuru line will become extinct (*parikshīṇeshu Kurushu*) a son will be born to you (=Uttarā, wife of Abhimanyu). The child will, for that reason, be named Parikshit."

in this connection. It shows the absence of a clear tradition. On the other hand there is absolute unanimity in regard to the parentage and dynastic position of the so-called Parikshit II.[1]

[1] The identification of the Vedic Parikshit with the son of Abhimanyu who flourished after the Bhārata War does not seem probable to Dr. N. Dutt, the author of *The Aryanisation of India*, pp. 50 ff., because, in the first place, it goes against the findings of Macdonell, Keith and Pargiter who prefer to identify the Vedic Parikshit with an ancestor of the Pāṇḍus. As to this it may be pointed out that the existence of a Parikshit (father of Janamejaya) *before* the Pāṇḍus, rests mainly *on the testimony* of those very genealogies which are regarded by Keith as worthless and unreliable (cf. *RPVU.*, 21. 618). That the name of Janamejaya in *this* connection is an *intrusion* into the genealogical texts is evident from its omission from Chapter 95 of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Java text*, the Chellur grant, etc.

Dr. Dutt next argues that the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* makes the four brothers Janamejaya, Śrutasena, etc., sons of Parikshit I. If he had only perused a subsequent passage (IV. 21. 1) he would have seen that the *Purāṇa* makes the four brothers sons of "Parikshit II" as well and while this later statement finds corroboration in the *Mahābhārata*, (I. 3. 1) the earlier does not.

Dr. Dutt next says that it is always risky to attempt identification of kings or the fixing of their dates from an examination of their teacher-priests' names. But why should it be risky if the names and order of succession be genuine? The real risk lies in the rejection of such evidence without sufficient examination. It should be remembered in this connection that the identification of the Vedic Pārikshita Janamejaya with his Epic namesake (descendant of Abhimanyu) does not depend mainly on the teacher-priests' names, but on the following facts, *viz.*, (1) absence of any cogent proof of the existence of an earlier Janamejaya Pārikshita in view of the omission of his name in the *Java text*, Choḍa inscriptions etc., and (2) agreement of particulars about the Vedic Parikshit and Janamejaya (*e.g.*, words describing the prosperity of the Kuru realm, the performance of two *Aśvamedhas*, quarrel with the Kaśyapas), with what we know of Parikshit and Janamejaya who were descendants of Abhimanyu. The question of the chronological relation between the Vedic Parikshit and the Vedic Janaka is entirely independent of this identification. This relation has been determined on the strength of two different lines of evidence. Materials for one have indeed been taken from the *Vaṁśa* list of the Brāhmanas. But the succession from Indrota to Somaśushma has been reconstructed from incidental notices in the Brāhmaṇa texts themselves which no critic has represented as late.

Dr. Dutt adds that identity of names does not necessarily imply identity of persons. This is a truism which is not remembered only by those who identify Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya with Dhṛitarāshṭra of Kāśī. It has never been suggested in the *Political History* that the Vedic and Epic Parikshits and Janamejayas are identical merely because their names are identical.

As to Dr. Dutt's contention that there could not be want of motives in later times on the part of the authors belonging to rival families and schools to associate a certain teacher-priest with a famous king of old, etc., it is not clear which particular case he has in mind in making the statement. The association of Indrota and Tura with Janamejaya, and that of Uddālaka and

The Vedic hymns throw little light on the domestic life or reign-period of Parikshit. From the epic we learn that he married a Madra princess (Mādravatī) and ruled for 24 years dying at the age of sixty.[1] Little credit, however, can be given to the bardic tales that cluster round his name. The only facts that can be accepted as historical are that he was a king of the Kurus, that the people lived prosperously under his rule, that he had many sons, and that the eldest, Janamejaya, succeeded him.

It will not be quite out of place here to say a few words about the **realm of the Kurus** over which Parikshit

Yājñavalkya with Janaka is found in the *Śatapatha* and *Aitareya Brāhmaṇas* and in the *Upanishads*. Is it suggested that such association is a deliberate concoction or fabrication? But no shred of evidence has been brought forward to prove such a charge. No doubt misrepresentations are met with in the Epics and the *Purānas* (as pointed out by Pargiter and others). But it would not be reasonable to argue that the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads* are guilty of deliberate falsification because forsooth there is confusion in the *Purāṇas* which are undoubtedly of a later date.

Lastly the credibility of the *Vaṁśa* lists in the Vedic texts has been assailed on the following grounds, *viz.*—

(1) Silence of Commentators.

(2) Discrepancy between the lists appended to the 10th and 14th books respectively of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* in regard to the authorship of the work and ascription of the work to different teachers.

(3) Scant courtesy shown to an alleged teacher by his pupil.

As to (1), the *Āchārya paramparā*, succession of teachers, is distinctly alluded to by the commentators. If they did not enter into a detailed explanation, it is because they considered it to be *sugamam, spashṭam*, easily intelligible, plain.

(2) There is *no Vaṁśa* list at the close of the 14th book of the *Brāhmaṇa proper* excluding the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*. There are no doubt lists of teachers at the end of the *Upanishad*. It is too much to expect that, in the various lists, the entire Brāhmaṇa as well as the Upanishad should be ascribed to the same traditional authority. The *Brāhmaṇa* and *Upanishad* texts are not works of single individuals. The question of discrepancy, therefore, does not arise. Reference to different traditions regarding the authorship of a particular work, or of particular portions of a work, does not necessarily vitiate any *Āchārya-paramparā* regarding which we have substantial agreement in the texts.

(3) It is too much to expect that in ancient, as in modern times, all pupils should be equally respectful to teachers. Was not Dhṛishtadyumna a pupil of Droṇāchārya whom he killed?

[1] *Mbh.*, I. 49, 17-26 with commentary. We learn from the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad* (III. 3. 1) that the Pārikshita family was intimately known in the Madra country.

ruled. The kingdom, according to epic tradition, stretched from the Sarasvatī to the Ganges. In the *Digvijaya-parva* it is taken to extend from the border of the land of the Kulindas (near the sources of the Sutlej, the Jumna and the Ganges) to that of the Sūrasenas and the Matsyas (in the Mathurā and Bairāṭ regions respectively), and from the frontier of Rohītaka (Rohtak in the Eastern Punjab) to that of the Pañchālas (of Rohilkhand). It was divided into three parts, Kurujāṅgala, the Kurus proper and Kurukshetra.[1] Kurujāṅgala, as its name implies, was probably the wild region of the Kuru realm that stretched from the Kāmyaka forest on the banks of the Sarasvatī to Khāṇḍava near (*samīpataḥ*) the Jumna.[2] But in certain passages it is used in a wider sense to designate the whole country (*deśa, rāshṭra*[3]). The Kurus proper were probably located in the district around Hāstinapura (on the Ganges), identified with a place near Meerut.[4] The boundaries of Kurukshetra are given in a passage of the *Taittirīya Araṇyaka*[5] as being Khāṇḍava on the south, the Tūrghna on the north, and the Parīṇah[6] on the west (lit. hinder section, *jaghanārdha*). The *Mahābhārata*[7] gives the following description of Kurukshetra: "South of the Sarasvatī, and north of the Dṛishadvatī, he who lives in Kurukshetra really dwells in heaven. The region that lies between Taruntuka and Marantuka or Arantuka, the lakes of Rāma and Macha-

[1] *Mbh.*, I 109. 1; 149 5-15; II 26-32, III. 83. 204. Ptolemy VII 1 42

[2]

Tataḥ Sarasvatīkūle sameshu marudhanvasu
Kāmyakam nāma dadriśur vanam munijanapriyam

"Then they saw before them the forest of *Kāmyaka* on the banks of the Sarasvatī on a level and wild plain, a favoured resort to anchorites." *Mbh.*, III. 5. 3. For the location of the Khāṇḍava forest see I 222 14; 223 1

[3] *Cf. Mbh*, 1. 109 24, viii 1. 17 xi. 37. 23

[4] Smith, *Oxford History* (1919), p. 31. Cf. *Rām*, II 68. 13 *Mbh.*, 1 128 29 ff; 133. 11; Pargiter *DKA*, 5; Patañjali, II. 1. 2 *anu Gangam Hāstinapuram.*

[5] *Vedic Index* 1. pp 169-70

[6] *Cf.* the Parenos of Arrian (Indika, iv), a tributary of the Indus

[7] iii, 83 4; 9; 15; 25; 40; 52; 200; 204-08.

kruka[1]—this is Kurukshetra which is also called Sāmanta-pañchaka and the northern sacrificial altar (*uttara vedi*) of the grandsire (*i.e.*, Brahmā)." Roughly speaking, the Kuru kingdom corresponded to modern Thanesar, Delhi and the greater part of the Upper Gangetic Doāb. Within the kingdom flowed the rivers Aruṇā (which joins the Sarasvatī near Pehoa), Aṁśumatī, Hiraṇvatī, Āpayā (Āpagā or Oghavatī, a branch of the Chitang), Kauśikī (a branch of the Rakshī), as well as the Sarasvatī and the Dṛishadvatī or the Rakshī.[2] Here, too, was situated Saryaṇāvat, which the authors of the *Vedic Index* consider to have been a lake, like that known to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* by the name of Anyataḥplakshā.

The royal residence according to the Vedic texts was apparently Āsandīvat.[3] This city may have been identical with Nāgasāhvaya or Hāstinapura, the capital mentioned in the Epics and the *Purāṇas*. But it is more probably represented by the modern Asandh near the Chitang.[4]

According to epic tradition the kings of Kurukshetra belonged to the **Puru-Bharata** family. The *Paurava* connection of the Kurus is suggested by the *Ṛigvedic* hymn,[5] which refers to "Kuru-śravaṇa" (lit. glory of the Kurus) as a descendant of Trasadasyu, a famous king of the Pūrus.[6] The connection of the Bharatas with the Kuruland is also attested by Vedic evidence. A Rigvedic ode[7] speaks of the two Bhāratas, Devaśravas

[1] Machakruka, Taruntuka and Marantuka are *Yaksha dvārapālas* guarding the boundaries of Kurukshetra.

[2] For the identification and location of some of the streams see *Mbh.*, III. 83 95, 151; V. *151*. 78; Cunningham's *Arch-Rep.*, for 1878-79 quoted in JRAS., 1883, 363n; Smith, *Oxford History*, 29; *Science and Culture*, 1943, pp. 468 ff.

[3] *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, p. 72.

[4] See the map, Smith, *Oxford History*, p. 29, An Āsandi district is mentioned by Fleet in his *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts* (Bombay Gazetteer, 1. 2, p. 492). But there is no reason for connecting it with the Kuru country.

[5] X. 33. 4.

[6] *Ṛigveda*, IV. 38. 1; VII. 19, 3.

[7] Ṛig. iii 23; Oldenberg, *Buddha*, pp. 409-10.

and Devavāta, as sacrificing in the land on the Dṛishadvatī, the Āpayā and the Sarasvatī. Some famous *gāthās* of the *Brāhmaṇas*[1] and the epic tell us that Bharata Dauḥshanti made offerings on the Jumna, the Ganges (*Yamunām anu Gaṅgāyām*) and the Sarasvatī. The territory indicated in these laudatory verses is exactly the region which is later on so highly celebrated as Kurukshetra.

In the opinion of Oldenberg "the countless small stocks of the *Saṁhitā* age were fused together to form the greater peoples of the *Brāhmaṇa* period. The Bharatas found their place, probably together with their old enemies, the Pūrus, within the great complex of peoples now in process of formation, the Kurus; their sacred land now became Kurukshetra."[2]

Among those kings who are mentioned in the genealogical lists of the *Mahābhārata*[3] as ancestors and

[1] *Śat. Br.* xiii. 5. 4. 11; *Ait. Br.*, viii. 23; *Mbh.*, vii. 66. 8.

[2] The absorption of the Bharatas by the Kurus is suggested by such passages as *Kuravo nāma Bhāratāḥ* (*Mbh.*, XII. 349. 44). In the *Rām.*, IV. 33. 11 Bharatas are still distinguished from the Kurus. It has been suggested by some scholars, *e.g.*, C. V. Vaidya (*History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II, pp. 268 ff.) that the Bharata of *Ṛigvedic* tradition is not to be identified with Dauḥshanti Bharata, the traditional progenitor of the Kuru royal family, but rather with Bharata, the son of Ṛishabha, a descendant of the first Manu called *Svāyambhuva*. It should, however, be remembered that the story of Bharata, son of Ṛishabha, is distinctly late. The Bharata princes and people of *Ṛigvedic* tradition are clearly associated with the Kuru country watered by the Sarasvatī and the Dṛishadvatī and the names of their rulers, *e.g.*, Divodāsa and Sudās occur in *Purāṇic* lists of kings descended from the son or daughter of Manu *Vaivasvata* and not of Manu *Svāyambhuva*. The Bharata priests Vaśishṭha and Viśvāmitra Kauśika are connected in early literature with the royal progeny of Manu Vaivasvata and his daughter, and not of Manu Svāyambhuva. For the association of Vaśishṭha with the descendants of Bharata Dauḥshanti see the story of Saṁvaraṇa and Tapatī in the *Mahābhārata*, I. 94 and 171 f. Viśvāmitra Kauśika's association with the Pūru-Bharata family is, of course, well-known (Mbh. I. 94. 33). It may be argued that Bharata, *ancestor* of Viśvāmitra, who is called *Bharata-ṛishabha* in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, must be distinguished from the later Bharata, the son of Śakuntalā, daughter of Viśvāmitra. But there is no real ground for believing that the story of Viśvāmitra's connection with the nymphs is based on sober history. The Ṛigvedic Viśvāmitra belonged to the family of Kuśika. In the *Mahābhārata* (I. 94. 33) the Kuśikas are expressly mentioned as descendants of Bharata Dauḥshanti.

[3] *Ādiparva*, Chapters 94 and 95.

predecessors of Parikshit, the *names* of the following occur in the Vedic literature: —

Purū-ravas Aila,[1] Āyu,[2] Yayāti Nahushya,[3] Pūru,[4] Bharata Dauḥshanti Saudyumni,[5] Ajamīḍha,[6] Ṛiksha,[7] Saṁvaraṇa,[8] Kuru,[9] Uchchaiḥśravas,[10] Pratīpa Prātisatvana or Prāti sutvana,[11] Balhika Prātipīya,[12] Śaṁtanu,[13] and Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya.[14]

The occurrence of these *names* in Vedic texts probably proves their historicity,[15] but it is difficult to say how far the epic account of their relationship with one another or with Parikshit, and the traditional order of succession, are reliable. Some of the kings may not have been connected with the Kurus at all. Others, *e.g.*, Uchchaiḥśravas Kaupayeya, Balhika Prātipīya and Śaṁtanu, were undoubtedly of the same race (*Kauravya*) as Parikshit.[16]

Purū-ravas Aila, the first king in the above list, is represented in epic tales as the son of a ruler who migrated from Bāhli in Central Asia to Mid-India.[17] It may be

[1] *Rig Veda*, X. 95; *Sat. Br.*, XI. 5. 1. 1.
[2] *Rig Veda*, I. 53. 10; II. 14. 7. etc.
[3] R. V., I. 31. 17; X. 63. 1.
[4] R. V., VII. 8. 4; 18. 13.
[5] *Sat. Br.*, XIII. 5. 4. 11-12; *Ait. Br.*, viii, 23.
[6] R. V., IV. 44. 6. [7] R. V., VIII. 68. 15.
[8] R. V., VIII. 51. 1. (*Vedic Index* II. 442).
[9] Frequently mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa literature, *cf.* Kuru-śravaṇa, *Rig-Veda*, X. 33. 4. see however, foot-note 15 below.
[10] *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa*, III. 29. 1-3.
[11] *Atharva Veda*, XX. 129. 2.
[12] *Sat. Br.*, XII. 9. 3. 3. [13] R. V., X. 98.
[14] *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā*, X. 6.
[15] It should, however, be noted that no individual king named Kuru is mentioned in Vedic literature. Kuru is the name of a people in the Vedic texts.
[16] *Jaiminīya Up. Br.*, III. 29. 1; *Sat. Br.*, XII. 9. 3; *Nirukta*. ed. by Kshemarāja Śrikṛishṇa Dāsa Śreṣṭhī, p. 190; *Bṛihaddevatā*, VII, 155-156; *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 7-8.
[17] *Rām.*, VII. 103, 21-22. This Bāhli lay outside the *Madhyadeśa* and is associated with Kārddama kings. The reference is doubtless to Balkh or Bactria in the Oxus Valley. For a discussion about its identity see *IHQ*. 1933. 37-39. The *Matsya Purāṇa*, 12. 14 ff. distinctly mentions Ilāvṛita-Varsha (in Central Asia) as the realm of the parent of Purū-ravas. *Mbh.*, III. 90. 22-25) however seems to locate the birth place of Purū-ravas on a hill near the source of the Ganges.

noted in this connection that the *Papañcha-sūdani* refers to the Kurus—the most important branch of the Ailas according to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*—as colonists from the trans-Himālayan region known as Uttara Kuru.[1] Bharata, another king mentioned in the epic list is described as a lineal descendant of Purū-ravas and of Pūru. But this is doubtful. He is, as we have seen, definitely associated in Brāhmanic and epic *gāthās* with the land on the Sarasvatī, the Ganges and the Jumna, and is credited with victory over the Satvats. The epic tradition that he was the progenitor of the Kuru royal family is in agreement with the Vedic evidence which connects him and his clansmen, Devaśravas and Deva-vāta, with the same territory which afterwards became famous as the land of the Kurus. Uchchaiḥśravas Kaupayeya had matrimonial relations with the royal family of the Pañchālas. But Balhika Prātipīya could ill conceal his jealousy of the ruler of the Sṛinjayas, a people closely associated with the Pañchālas in epic tales. The word Balhika in the name Balhika Prātipīya seems to be a personal designation and there is no clear evidence that it is in any way connected with the Balhika tribe mentioned in the *Atharva Veda* and later texts. It may, however, point to the northern origin of the Kurus[2] of the "Middle country," a theory rendered probable by the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvṛishas[3] and the fact that a section of the Kuru people dwelt beyond the Himālayas in the days of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Mahābhā-*

[1] Law, *Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes*, p. 16 Note the association of the Kurus with the Mahāvṛisha, *Vedic Index*, II. 279n, and with the Bālhikas, *Mbh* II. 63. 2-7 In *Mbh*. III. 145. 18-19 the Uttara Kurus are apparently placed near Mount Kailāsa and Badarī. In other texts they are located much farther to the north. The Kurus of the *Madhya-deśa* are called *Dakshiṇa-Kurus* in *Mbh*., I. 109. 10.

[2] Note the association of the Prātipeyas of the Kuru assembly with the Bālhikas in *Mbh*. ii. 63. 2-7; *Pratipeyāḥ Śāntanavā Bhīmasenāḥ sa Bālhikāḥ*... .. *triṇudhvaṁ Kāvyāṁ vāchaṁ saṁsadi Kauravāṇām*.

[3] *Vedic Index*, II. 279n 5; *Sat. Br*. (Kaṇva text); for Balhikas and Mahāvṛishas see also *Atharva Veda*, V. 22. 4-8.

rata. The history of the Kuru royal line becomes more definite from the time of Śaṁtanu who was fifth in the ascending line from Parikshit. Regarding the events of Parikshit's reign we have little reliable information. We only know that the drought that threatened the Kuru realm in the time of Śaṁtanu had passed away and the people "throve merrily in the kingdom of Parikshit."

The **date of Parikshit** is a matter regarding which the Vedic texts give no direct information. In the Aihole Inscription of Ravikīrti, panegyrist of Pulakeśin II, dated Śaka 556 (expired) = A.D. 634-35, it is stated that at that time 3735 years had passed since the Bhārata War:

Triṁśatsu tri-sahasreshu Bhāratād āhavād itaḥ
saptābda-śata-yukteshu gateshvabdeshu pañchasu.[1]

The date of the *Bhārata* war which almost synchronised with the birth of Parikshit, is, according to this calculation, and the testimony of Āryabhaṭa (A.D. 499), 3102 B.C. This is the starting point of the so-called *Kali-yuga* era. But, as pointed out by Fleet[2], the reckoning was not founded in Vedic times. It is an invented one, devised by Hindu astronomers and chronologists for the purposes of their calculations some thirty-five centuries after the initial point which they assigned to it. As a matter of fact another school of Hindu astronomers and historians, represented by Vṛiddha-Garga, Varāhamihira and Kalhaṇa, placed the heroes of the *Bhārata war* 653 years after the beginning of the Kali-yuga and 2526 years before the Śaka era, *i.e.*, in B.C. 2449.[3] This last date is as much open to doubt as the one adopted by Āryabhaṭa and Ravikīrti. The literature that embodies the Vṛiddha-Garga tradition cannot claim any higher antiquity or reliability than the composition of the great astronomer of Kusumapura. The chronology to which it gives

[1] Ep. Ind., VI, pp. 11, 12.

[2] JRAS., 1911, pp 479 ff, 675 ff.

[3] *Āsan Maghāsu munayaḥ śāsati pṛithvīṁ Yudhishṭhire nṛipatau shad-dvika-pañcha-dviyutaḥ Śakakālastasya rājñaścha. Bṛih.* S., XIII. 3. Cf. *Rajataraṅgiṇi*, I. 48-56.

preference is not accepted by the Aihole inscription of Ravikīrti. A noted writer,[1] who accepts the dating of Vṛiddha-Garga and Varāha, cites only two late cases (*op. cit.* p. 401) to prove its currency in India, *viz.*, the commentary on the *Bhāgavatāmṛita* and certain modern Almanacs. His attempts to support this tradition by astronomical calculation based on certain *Mahābhārata* passages are beset with difficulties. For one thing there is a good deal of uncertainty regarding the starting point of what he calls the "Purāṇic" or "epic" Kaliyuga. He says (p. 399) "*most likely the Mahābhārata* Kaliyuga truly began from the year 2454 B.C. The year of the Bhārata battle according to his finding is however 2449 B.C. In other words the battle was fought *five years after* the epic Kaliyuga *had already begun*. But he himself points out (p. 393) that the battle was fought, according to the *Mahābhārata*, when it was the junction of (*antara*, really interval between) *Kali* and *Dvāpara*, and 36 years before the year of Krishna's expiry (p. 399) which was the true *beginning of the Kaliyuga*. Thus the dates assigned to the beginning of Kali do not agree. These discrepancies demonstrate the unstable character of the ground on which the chronological edifice is sought to be built. It may be remembered in this connection that Kalhaṇa, who places Gonarda I of Kashmir and the Bhārata War in 2449-8 B.C. fixes a date for Aśoka much earlier than Gonarda III (1182 B.C.). This result is opposed to all genuine historical evidence and proves the unreliable character of the scheme of chronology which has for its basis a belief in 2449 B.C. as the date of the Bhārata War. Some writers[2] try to reconcile the conflicting view presented by the schools of Āryabhaṭa and Vṛiddha-Garga by suggesting that the *Śaka-kāla*, of Varāhamihira is really *Śākya-kāla*, *i.e.*, the era of the Buddha's *Nirvāṇa*. This

[1] Mr. P. C. Sen Gupta, *Bhārata Battle Traditions*, *JRASB*. IV, 1938, No. 3 (Sept. 1939, pp. 393-413).

[2] *IHQ*, 1932, 85; *Mod. Rev.*, June, 1932, 650 ff.

conjecture is not only opposed to the evidence of Kalhaṇa, but is flatly contradicted by Bhaṭṭotpala who explains *Śaka-kāla* of the *Bṛhat Saṁhitā* passage as *Śaka-nṛipa-kāla*, era of the Śaka king.[1] Varāhamihira himself knew of no *Śaka-kāla* apart from the *Śakendrakāla* or *Śaka-bhūpa-kāla, i.e.*, the era of the Śaka *king*.[2]

A third tradition is recorded by the compilers of the *Purāṇas*. There is a remarkable verse, found with variants in the historical *Purāṇas*, which places the birth of Parikshit 1050 (or 1015, 1115, 1500 etc. according to some manuscripts), years before Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king of Magadha:

Mahāpadm-ābhishekāt tu
yāvajjanma Parīkshitaḥ
evaṁ varshasahasraṁ tu
jñeyaṃ pañchāśaduttaram.[3]

If the reading *Pañchāśaduttaram* be correct, the verse would seem to point to a date in the fourteenth or fifteenth century B.C. for the birth of Parikshit. It is, however, doubtful if even this tradition can be regarded as of great value. In the first place the divergent readings in the different Mss. take away from the value of the chronological datum. Secondly, the *Purāṇas* themselves in giving details about the dynasties that are supposed to have intervened between the Bhārata war and the coronation of Mahāpadma mention totals of reigns which when added together neither present a unanimous tradi-

[1] The *Bṛhat-Samhitā* by Varāhamihira with the commentary of Bhaṭṭotpala, edited by Sudhākara Dvivedī, p. 281.

[2] *Bṛhat Saṁhitā*, VIII, 20-21.

[3] Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 58. From the account of Pargiter it appears that the reading *Pañcha-śatottaram*, finds no support in the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* texts. The variant *Śatam pañchadaśottaram* occurs only in some Bhāgavata Mss. *'Pañchadaś-ottaram'* is however unknown to the *Matsya* One *Matsya* Ms. has *'Śato trayam.'* The reading generally accepted by the scribes seems to have been *Pañchāśad-uttaram*. The biggest figure (1500) is probably obtained by the wrong inclusion within the Magadhan list of the Pradyotas of Avanti and taking the period of Bārhadratha rule to cover 1000 instead of 723 years. 1000 (for the Bārhadrathas) + 152 (for the Pradyotas) + 360 (for the Śaiśunāgas) = 1512 years.

tion nor correspond to the figure 1050, which alone finds general acceptance in the *Matsya*, the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa* manuscripts. The discrepancies may no doubt be partially explained by the well-known fact that the Purāṇic chroniclers often represent contemporaneous lines *e.g.* the Pradyotas and the Bimbisārids, as following one another in regular succession. But there is another point which deserves notice in this connection. The same passage which says that "from Mahāpadma's inauguration to the birth of Parikshit, this interval is indeed 1050 years," adds that "the interval which elapsed from the last Andhra king Pulomāvi to Mahāpadma was 836 years." As most of the *Purāṇas* agree in assigning a period of 100 years to Mahāpadma and his sons who were followed immediately by Chandragupta Maurya, the interval between Chandragupta and Pulomāvi, according to the *Purāṇic* chronology, will be 836—100—736 years. Now as Chandragupta could not have ascended the throne before 326 B.C., Pulomāvi, according to the calculation of the *Purāṇas*, cannot be placed earlier than 410 A.D. But this date can hardly be reconciled with what we know about the history of the Deccan in the first half of the fifth century A.D. Contemporary records show that the territory that had acknowledged the sway of Pulomāvi and his ancestors was at that time under the Vākāṭakas and other dynasties that rose on the ruins of the so-called "Andhra," or Śātavāhana empire. This emphasizes the need of caution in utilizing the chronological data of the Purāṇas.[1]

An attempt has been made in recent times to support the Purāṇic date for Parikshit and the Bhārata War which is taken to correspond to c. 1400 B.C.,[2] by calculations based on the *Vaṁśa* lists of teachers and pupils

[1] See also Raychaudhuri. *The Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect*, second edition, pp. 62ff.

[2] Dr. Altekar, *Presidential Address to the Archaic Section of the Indian History Congress, Proceedings of the Third Session*, 1939, pp. 68-77.

preserved in the Vedic literature. The importance of these lists was emphasized in these very pages as early as 1923. But the data they yield have been made to square with the chronological scheme adumbrated in some of the Purāṇic Mss with the help of a number of assumptions for which no cogent proofs have been adduced. It has, for instance, been taken for granted that the *Vaṁśa* list given at the end of the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad* is virtually contemporaneous with those found in the *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa* and the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa,* and that all the lists "must be" dated *"not later than* c. 550 B.C." (*op. cit.* p. 70). A few pages further on (p. 77) the date of the *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa* is stated to be "c. 550 B.C." (the words "not later than" being omitted). The mere fact that the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad* and other works of the *Śruti* literature are generally regarded as Pre-Buddhist cannot be taken to prove that the entire lists of teachers and pupils appended to or inserted in all of them can claim equal antiquity. Scholars in assigning the period before 500 B.C. to the Vedic literature expressly exclude "its latest excrescences."[1] Pāṇini[2] draws a distinction between Vedic works which, to him, are *Purāṇaprokta* and those that he does not obviously regard as equally old. The date "c. 550 B.C." has even less justification than the vague words "not later than c. 550 B.C."

It has been stated further that the period separating the priests of Janamejaya from c. 550 B.C. is 800 years. This figure is obtained by accepting the round number 40 for the intervening generations and assigning to each generation in the *guruśishya paramparā* a period of 20 years. The probative value of this mode of calculation is impaired by the fact that the actual number of teachers of the period given in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad* is 45 and not 40 (p. 70), and the true average length of a spiritual generation is, according to Jaina and Buddhist

[1] Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, p. 27
[2] IV. 3. 105.

evidence, about 30 and not 20 years.[1] Moreover, it should not be forgotten that if the lists which form the basis of calculation are really to be dated *'not later than* c. 550 B.C.,' c. 1350 B.C. (550 + 800) can only be regarded as a *terminus ad quem*. The *terminus a quo* still remains to be determined. The uncertainty regarding the date of the particular *Vaṁśa* lists, on which the whole chronological theory rests, lays even the lower limit open to objection.

Tradition recorded in the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* points to a date for the Pārikshitas which is much later than that assigned to them by Purāṇic chroniclers and astronomers of the Gupta Age.[2] It refers to Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī (c. 500 B.C.), as fifth in lineal succession from Parikshit. The evidence is late but the text professes to embody tradition that goes back to Guṇāḍhya who is known to Bāṇa (c. 600 A.D.) and is assigned to the Śātavāhana period.

A comparatively late date, albeit not the date suggested by the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara,* can also be inferred from certain passages in the later Vedic texts. We shall show in the next section that Parikshit's son and successor Janamejaya was separated by five or six generations of teachers from the time of Janaka of the *Upanishads* and his contemporary Uddālaka Āruṇi. At the end of the *Kaushītaki* or *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*[3] we find a *vaṁśa* or list of the teachers by whom the knowledge contained in that *Āraṇyaka* is supposed to have been handed down. The opening words of this list run thus: —

"Om ! Now follows the *vaṁśa*. Adoration to the Brahman ! Adoration to the teachers ! We have learnt this text from Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana from Kahola Kaushītaki, Kahola Kaushītaki from Uddālaka Āruṇi"[4]

[1] *Jacobi, Pariśishtaparvan*, 2nd ed xviii; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist. Suttas* Introduction, xlvii.

[2] *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, IX 6-7 ff. Penzer, I. 95.

[3] *Adhāya* 15.

[4] *S.B.E.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 1

The passage quoted above makes it clear that Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana was separated by two generations from the time of Uddālaka who was separated by five or six generations from the time of Janamejaya. Guṇākhya, therefore, lived seven or eight generations after Parikshit. He could not have flourished much later than Āśvalāyana because the latter, or preferably his pupil, honours his *guru* Kahola.[1] It is to be noted that we have no personal name prefixed to Āśvalāyana as we have in the case of Śāṅkhāyana. This probably suggests that Vedic tradition knew only of *one* great teacher named Āśvalāyana. It is significant that both in Vedic and Buddhist literature this famous scholar is associated with one and the same locality, *viz.*, Kosala, modern Oudh. The *Praśna Upanishad* tells us that Āśvalāyana was a *Kausalya, i.e.*, an inhabitant of Kosala, and a contemporary of Kabandhī Kātyāyana. These facts enable us to identify him with Assalāyana of Sāvatthi (a city in Kosala) mentioned in the *Majjhima Nikāya*[2] as a famous Vedic scholar,[3] and a contemporary of Gotama Buddha and, hence, of Kakuda[4] or Pakudha Kachchāyana. The reference to Gotama's contemporary as a master of *keṭubha, i.e., kalpa* or ritual, makes it exceedingly probable that he is to be identified with the famous Āśvalāyana of the *Gṛihya Sūtras*. Consequently the latter must have lived in the sixth century B.C. Guṇākhya Śāṇkhāyana, whose teacher Kahola is honoured by the famous *Gṛihyasūtra-kāra*, cannot be placed later than that century. That the upper limit of Guṇākhya's date is not far removed from the lower one is suggested in the first place by the reference in his *Āraṇyaka* to Paushkarsādi, Lauhitya and a teacher who is styled Magadhavāsī. The first two figure, in the

[1] *Āśvalāyana Gṛihya Sūtra*, III. 4. 4.

[2] II. 147, *et seq.*

[3] "*Tiṇṇaṁ*

[4] As to the equation *kabandhī = kakuda*, see IHQ, 1932, 603 ff. *Kabandha* in *the Atharva Veda*, X. 2.3 means *śroṇi* and *ūru* (hips and thighs). According to Amara *kakudmati* has substantially the same meaning.

Ambaṭṭha and *Lohichcha suttas*, among the contemporaries of the Buddha. The attitude of respect towards a Magadhan teacher in the *Āraṇyaka* points to an age later than that reflected in the *Śrauta Sūtras* which mention Brāhmaṇas hailing from the locality in question in a depreciatory tone as *Brahmabandhu Māgadha-deśīya*.[1]

Goldstücker points out[2] that Pāṇini used the word *Āraṇyaka* only in the sense of 'a man living in the forest'. It is Kātyāyana (c. fourth century B.C.) who vouchsafes in a *Vārttika* the information that the same expression is also used in the sense of treatises 'read in the forest'. The silence of Pāṇini in regard to this additional meaning of the term, when contrasted with the clear statement of the later grammarian, leaves little room for doubt that *Āraṇyaka* in the sense of a forest-treatise was well-known to writers traditionally assigned to the fourth century B.C., but not to Pāṇini. It may be recalled in this connection that, unlike Kātyāyana again, Pāṇini does not include the works of Yājñavalkya, a contemporary of Kahola, the teacher of Guṇākhya, among the older (*Purāṇa-prokta*) *Brāhmaṇas*.[3] Śvetaketu, another contemporary of Kahola, teacher of Guṇākhya, is mentioned in the *Dharmasūtra* of Āpastamba[4] as an *avara* or modern authority. The reference to *Yavanānī* in the *sūtras*[5] of Pāṇini and the tradition recorded in the *Kāvya-Mīmāṁsā*[6] that he made his mark in the city of Pāṭalīputra (founded, as we know, after the death of the Buddha, c. 486 B.C., in the reign of Udāyin), clearly suggest that he could not have flourished before the sage of the Śākyas. Pro-

[1] *Vedic Index*, II. 116. Isolated references to Paushkarasādi and others may not be of much value. What we have to consider is the *cumulative effect* of the references in the *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* combined with the testimony of Pāṇini and Āpastamba.

[2] *Pāṇini, His Place in Sanskrit Literature*, 1914, 99.

[3] IV. 3. 105 with commentary quoted on page 106n of Goldstücker's *Pāṇini*, *Yājñavalkyādayo hi na chirakālā vyākhyāneshu vārtā.*

[4] *Dharmasūtra*, 1. 2, 5, 4-6.

[5] IV. I. 49

[6] P. 55.

found as his knowledge is in regard to Vedic literature, Pāṇini is unaware of the existence of Āraṇyakas as a class of forest-treatises. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that he could not have been considerably posterior to the great masters of the *Āraṇyakas* among whom Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana holds an honoured place. In other words, the upper limit of the date of this teacher almost coincides with the lower. With a date for him in the sixth century B.C. all the evidence accommodates itself.

We are now left with the task of attempting to measure the distance between Guṇākhya and Parikshit. Professor Rhys Davids in his *Buddhist Suttas* assigns 150 years to the five *Theras* from Upāli to Mahinda. Jacobi, too, informs us that the average length of a patriarchate may be estimated at about 30 years. We may, therefore, assign 240 or 270 years to the eight or nine generations from Parikshit to Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, and place the former in the ninth century B.C.

Parikshit was succeeded on the Kuru throne by his eldest son **Janamejaya** The *Mahābhārata* refers to a great snake-sacrifice performed by this king. In this connection it is stated that the king conquered Taxila.[1] It is clear from the *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*[2] and the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[3] that the epic account of the Kuru king's *Sarpa-satra* cannot be regarded as having any historical basis. There is hardly any doubt that the *Satra* mentioned in the Vedic texts is the prototype of the famous sacrifice described in the epic. The story seems to have undergone three stages of development. The original tale is concerned with a mythical rite performed by the serpents one of whom was named Janamejaya, who served as an *Adhvaryu* (priest). "Through this rite the serpents van-

[1] *Mbh.*, 1. 3. 20. For early references to Taxila, see also Pāṇini, IV. 3. 93. *Vinaya Texts*, Pt. II, p. 174; Malalasekera, *Dictionary*, I. p. 982.

[2] XXV. 15; *Vedic Index*, I, p. 274.

[3] Vol. II, p. 298; XVII. 18.

quished death." The next stage is reached in the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*. Janamejaya appears among the kings and princes of the serpents assembled for sacrifice in human shape at Khāṇḍavaprastha (in the Kuru country) with the object of obtaining poison. In the epic the performer of the sacrifice is identified with the Kuru king; and the object of the sacrifice is not the acquisition of immortality for the serpents, or of poison, but the extinction of these reptiles. It is impossible to find in the doings of these venomous creatures a reference to an historic strife.[1]

The conquest of Taxila by the Kuru king may, however, be an historical fact, because King Janamejaya is represented as a great conqueror in the *Brāhmaṇas*. Thus the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* says:[2] "*Janamejayaḥ Pārikshitaḥ Samantaṁ sarvataḥ pṛithivīṁ jayan parīyāyāśvena cha medhyeneje, tadeshā yajña-gathā gīyate*:

Āsandīvati dhānyādaṁ rukmiṇaṁ karitasrajam
aśvaṁ babandha sāraṅgaṁ[3] *devebhyo Janamejaya iti*"

"Janamejaya Pārikshita went round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offered the horse in sacrifice." Regarding this a sacrificial verse is sung:

"In Āsandīvat Janamejaya bound for the gods a black-spotted grain-eating horse, adorned with a golden ornament and with yellow garlands."[4]

In another passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[5] it is stated that Janamejaya aspired to be a "*Sarvabhūmi*", *i.e.*, a universal sovereign:

"*Evaṁvidaṁ hi vai māmevaṁvido yājayanti tasmād ahaṁ jayāmyabhītvarīṁ senāṁ jayāmyabhītvaryā senayā*

[1] *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, translated by Dr. W. Caland, p. 641; *cf* Winternitz, *JBBrRAS.*, 1926, 74 ff. Pargiter, *AIHT*, p 285, observes that "the Nāgas killed Parikshit II, but his son Janamejaya III defeated them and peace was made!"

[2] VIII. 21.

[3] Variant—*abadhnādaśvam sārangam*—*Śat. Br* xiii. 5 4. 1-2

[4] Keith. *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, 336, Eggeling, *Śat Br* V, p 396

[5] VIII 11.

na mā divyā na mānushya ishava richhantyeshyāmi sarva-māyuḥ sarvabhūmir bhavishyāmīti."

(Janamejaya Pārikshita used to say) "Those who know thus sacrifice for me who know thus ; therefore I conquer the assailing host, I conquer with an assailing host. Me neither the arrows of heaven nor of men reach. I shall live all my life, I shall become lord of all the earth."

The possession of Taxila in the extreme north-west implies control over Madra or the central Pañjāb, the homeland of Janamejaya's mother Mādravatī.[1] In this connection it may be remembered that the western frontier of the Kuru country once extended as far as the Pariṇah or Parenos, a tributary of the Indus. Princes of the Paurava race ruled in the territory lying between the Jhelam and the Rāvi down to the time of Alexander, while Ptolemy, the geographer, expressly mentions the Pāṇḍus as the rulers of Śākala (Śiālkoṭ) in the heart of this extensive region.

It was presumably after his victorious campaigns that Janamejaya was consecrated with the *Punar-abhisheka* and the *Aindra mahābhisheka*, performed two horse-sacrifices and had a dispute with Vaiśampāyana and the Brāhmaṇas. The *Matsya* version, which is considered by Pargiter to be the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest ; but the *Vāyu* version says he perished and the Brāhmaṇas made his son king. The broad facts of the Purāṇic narrative are confirmed by the evidence of the Brāhmaṇas. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* refers to one of the horse-sacrifices, and says that the priest who performed the rite for him was Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* mentions the other sacrifice and names Tura Kāvasheya as his priest. It also contains a tale stating that at one sacrifice of his he did not employ the Kaśyapas, but the Bhūtavīras. Thereupon a family of the Kaśyapas called Asita-mṛiga forcibly

[1] The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (I. xvi. 2) mentions Irāvatī, daughter of Uttara as the mother of Janamejaya and his brothers.

took away the conduct of the offering from the Bhūtavīras. We have here probably the germ of the *Purāṇic* stories about Janamejaya's dispute with the Brāhmaṇas. Vaiśampāyana, who headed the opponents of Janamejaya, undoubtedly belonged to the Kaśyapa clan. An allusion to the famous quarrel occurs also in the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* (*kopāj-Janamejayo Brāhmaṇeshu vikrāntaḥ*).

The *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* narrates an anecdote of Janamejaya and two ganders, pointing out the importance of *Brahmacharya*, and the time which should be devoted to it. The story is obviously mythical but it shows that Janamejaya was already looked upon as a legendary hero in the time of the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*.[1]

Janamejaya's capital, according to a sacrificial song (*yajña-gāthā*) quoted above, was Āsandīvat to which reference has already been made. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* affords an interesting glimpse of life in the royal palace or sacrificial hall:

Samānāntsadam ukshanti hayān kāshṭhabhṛito yathā
pūrṇān parisrutaḥ kumbhān Janamejayasādana' iti

"Even as they constantly sprinkle the equal prize-winning steeds so (they pour out) the cups full of fiery liquor in the palace (or sacrificial hall) of Janamejaya."[2] "Curds, stirred drink or liquor" were favourite beverages of the Kurus already in the days of Parikshit.

If the *Mahābhārata* is to be believed, Janamejaya sometimes held his court at Taxila, and it was at Taxila that Vaiśampāyana is said to have related to him the story of the great conflict between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus[3] who had for their allies several peoples including the Sṛiñjayas. No direct independent proof of this war is forthcoming,

[1] *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by R. L. Mitra and Harachandra Vidyābhūshana, pp. 25 ff (I. 2. 5). In connection with the legend referred to above we hear of a sage named Dantābala Dhaumra who is identified by some writers with Dantāla Dhaumya of the *Jaiminīya Brāhmana*. The conjecture lacks proof. In the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, Vol. III, p. 449, "Dhumras, Dhumrāyaṇas and Dhaumyas" find separate mention as *distinct* members of the Kaśyapa group.

[2] *Śat. Br.* XI. 5. 5. 13. Eggeling, V. 95.

[3] *Mbh.*, XVIII. 5. 34.

but allusions to the hostility of Kurus and Sṛiñjayas, which forms an important feature of the epic ballads, are met with in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[1] Moreover Hopkins invites attention to a *gāthā* in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[2] which alludes to the mare which saves the Kurus: —

Yato yata āvartate tat tad gachchhati mānavaḥ
....Kurūn aśvābhirakshati.

The verse cannot fail to recall the disaster (*Kurūṇām vaiśasam*) referred to in the *Mahābhārata*.[3]

It may be asserted that the Pāṇḍus are a body of strangers unknown to the Vedic texts, and that, therefore, the story of *their* feuds with the Kurus must be post-Vedic. But such a conclusion would be wrong because, firstly, an *argumentum ex silentio* is seldom conclusive, and, secondly, the Pāṇḍus are, according to Indian tradition, not a body of strangers but in fact scions of the Kurus. Hopkins indeed says that they were an unknown folk connected with the wild tribes located north of the Ganges.[4] But Patañjali[5] calls Bhīma, Nakula and Sahadeva Kurus.[6] Hindu tradition is unanimous in representing the Pāṇḍavas as an offshoot of the Kuru race just as the Kurus themselves were an offshoot of the Bharatas. The very name of the Great Epic betrays the Bhārata (Kuru) connection of the principal heroes and combatants. The testimony of Buddhist literature points to the same conclusion. In the *Dasa-Brāhmaṇa Jātaka*[7] a king "of the stock of Yuddhiṭṭhila" reigning "in the kingdom of Kuru and the city called Indapatta" is distinctly called "Koravya," *i.e.*, Kauravya—belonging to the Kuru race. The polyandrous

[1] The battle of Kurukshetra is very often described a fight between the Kurus and the Sṛiñjayas (*Mbh.*, VI. 45. 2; 60. 29; 72. 15; 73. 41; VII. 20. 41; 149. 40, VIII. 47. 23; 57. 12; 59. 1; 93. 1). The unfriendly feeling between these two peoples is distinctly alluded to in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* XII. 9. 3.
[1] ff., *Vedic Index*, II, p. 63).

[2] IV. 17. 9-10. *The Great Epic of India*, p. 385.

[3] *Mbh.*, IX. 35. 20.

[4] *The Religions of India*, p. 388.

[5] IV. 1. 4.

[6] *Ind. Ant.*, I, p. 350.

[7] *Jātaka* No. 495.

marriage of the Pāṇḍavas does not necessarily indicate that they are of non-Kuru origin. The system of *Niyoga* prevalent among the Kurus of the *Madhya-deśa* was not far removed from fraternal polyandry,[1] while the law (*Dharma*) of marriage honoured by the Northern Kurus was admittedly lax.[2]

Already in the time of Āśvalāyana's *Gṛihya Sūtra*[3] Vaiśampāyana was known as *Mahābhāratāchārya*. He is also mentioned in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*[4] and the *Ashṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini.[5] Whether the traditional reciter of the original *Mahābhārata* was actually a contemporary of Janamejaya or not, cannot be ascertained at the present moment. But I have found nothing in the Vedic literature itself which goes against the epic tradition. The early Vedic texts no doubt make no reference to the *Mahābhārata*, but they mention *Itihāsas*.[6] It is well-known that the story supposed to have been recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya was at first called an *Itihāsa* and was named *Jaya*[7] or song of victory, *i.e.*, victory of the Pāṇḍus, the ancestors of the king:

Muchyate sarvapāpebhyo Rāhuṇā Chandramā yathā
Jayo nāmetihāso' yaṁ śrotavyo vijigīshuṇā.[8]

"By listening to this story one escapes from all kinds of sin, like the Moon from Rāhu. This *Itihāsa* (story,

[1] See also my *"Political History,"* pp. 95, 96; *Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University)*, Vol. IX. and the *Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect*, second edition, pp 43-45 Also *Mbh* , I. 103, 9-10. 105, 37-38, Winternitz in *JRAS*, 1897, 755 ff; Āpastamba ii. 27. 3; Bṛihaspati, xxvii. It is to be noted that in spite of the alleged family custom in the Pāṇḍu line no other wife except Draupadī was shared by the Pāṇḍava brothers, and their children had no common wife. In the epic 'Kuru' and 'Pāṇḍu' no doubt often find separate mention. In a similar way historians distinguish between the related houses of 'Plantagenet,' 'York' and 'Lancaster'; 'Capet,' 'Valois,' 'Bourbon' and 'Orleans'; 'Chaulukya' and 'Vāghela.'

[2] *Mbh* , I. 122. 7.

[3] III. 4.

[4] I. 7. 5.

[5] IV. 3. 104.

[6] *A. V.*, XV. 6. 11-12.

[7] *Cf.* V. V. Vaidya, *Mahābhārata: A Criticism*, p. 2; and S. Levi in *Bhand. Com. Vol.*, pp. 99 sqq.

[8] Mbh., *Ādi*, 62, 20; *Cf. Udyoga*, 136, 18.

legend) is named *Jaya* (*Victory*); it should be listened to by those that desire victory."

Janamejaya's brothers. Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena, appear in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[1] and the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[2] as performers of the horse-sacrifice.[3] At the time of the *Bṛihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad* their life and end excited popular curiosity and were discussed with avidity in learned circles. It is clear that the sun of the Pārikshitas had set before the time of the *Upanishad*,[4] and it is also clear that they had been guilty of some sinful deeds which they had atoned for by their horse-sacrifice. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* quotes a *gāthā* which says: —

Pārikshitā yajamānā aśvamedhaiḥ paro'varam
ajahuḥ karmapāpakaṁ puṇyāḥ puṇyena karmaṇā.[5]

The righteous Pārikshitas, performing horse-sacrifices, by their righteous work did away with sinful work one after another."

It may be presumed that the breach with the 'lords spiritual' of those days was healed in this way and for the time being priests and princes in the Kuru country lived in harmony. The *Purāṇas* state that Janamejaya was succeeded by **Satanika** Śatānika's son and successor was Aśvamedha-datta. From Aśvamedha-datta was born **dhisima-krAishna** famed in the *Vāyu* and *Matsya Purāṇas*. Adhisīma-kṛishṇa's son was **Nichakshu.** During Nichakshu's reign the city of Hāstinapura is said to have been

[1] XIII. 5. 4. 3.

[2] XVI. 9. 7.

[3] Did these three brothers take part in the sacrifices of Janamejaya? Such a participation is clearly suggested by *Mbh.* I. 3. 1.

[4] The question "Whither have the Pārikshitas gone?" does not imply their *extinction;* Pargiter himself points out that the answer "Thither where *Asvamedha* sacrificers go" suggests the opposite because such sacrifices procured great blessings. *AIHT.,* 114. The *Rāmāyana,* too, includes Janamejaya (II. 64 42) in a list of kings who attained to a glorious destiny.

[5] *Śat. Br.,* XIII. 5. 4. 3. *Cf. Mbh.* XII. *152,* 38. The sinful deeds of which the eldest of the Pārikshitas was guilty according to the epic, were *Brahmahatyā* and *bhrūṇahatyā* (*ibid., 150* Verses 3 and 9). Cf. also *Śat. Br.,* XIII 5. 4. 1.

carried away by the Ganges, and the king is said to have transferred his residence to Kauśāmbī, or Kosam near Allahabad.[1]

The Vedic texts do not refer in clear terms to any of these successors of Janamejaya or to the city of Hāstinapura which figures as the principal metropolis of the Kurus in the epic and the Purāṇas. The antiquity of the city is, however, clearly proved by the evidence of Pāṇini.[2] As to the princes the *Ṛig-Veda* no doubt mentions a (Bhārata) king named Aśvamedha,[3] but there is nothing to show that he is identical with Aśvamedha datta. A Śatānīka Sātrājita is mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* as a powerful king who defeated Dhṛitarāshṭra a prince of Kāsi, and took away his sacrificial horse. He, too, was probably a Bharata,[4] but the patronymic Sātrājita probably indicates that he was different from Śatānīka, the son of Janamejaya. The *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*, the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa* and the *Chhāndogya Upanishad* mention a Kuru king named **Abhipratarin** Kākshaseni, who was a contemporary of Girikshit Auchchamanyava, Śaunaka Kāpeya and Dṛiti Aindrota. As Dṛiti was the son and pupil of Indrota Daivāpa (Daivāpi) Śaunaka, the priest of Janamejaya,[5] Abhipratārin, son of Kakshasena, appears to have been one of the immediate successors of the great king. We have already seen that Kakshasena appears in the *Mahābhārata*[6] as the name of a brother of Janamejaya. Abhipratārin was thus Janame-

[1] *Gaṅgayāpahṛite tasmin nagare Nāgasāhvaye*
tyaktvā Nichakshur nagaraṁ Kauśāmbyāṁ sa nivatsyati.

When the city of Nāgasāhvaya (Hāstinapura) is carried away by the Ganges, Nichakshu will abandon it and will dwell in Kauśāmbī.

Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 5.

That Hāstinapura stood on the Ganges is clear from the Rāmāyaṇa (II. 68. 13), the *Mahābhārata* (I, 128), and the *Mahābhāshya* (*anugaṅgaṁ Hāstinapuram*).

[2] VI. 2, 101.

[3] V. 27. 4-6.

[4] *Śat. Br.* XIII, 5. 4. 19-23.

[5] *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa*; *Vedic Index*, Vol. I, pp. 27, 373.

[6] I. 94. 54.

jaya's nephew. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[1] refer to a prince named **Vriddhadyumna** Ābhipratāriṇa, apparently the son of Abhipratārin. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[2] possibly mentions his son Rathagṛitsa and priest Śuchivṛiksha Gaupālāyana.[3] The *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[4] informs us that Vṛiddhadyumna erred in a sacrifice, when a Brāhmaṇa uttered a curse that the result would be the expulsion of the Kurus from Kuru-kshetra, an event which actually came to pass.

Sacrifices threatened to have serious repercussions on the fortunes of the royal family even in the days of Janamejaya. The performance of ritual in the approved form by proper persons seems to have excited as much interest in the Kuru country as philosophical discussions did at the court of Videha. Even in the fourth century B.C. the great Chandragupta Maurya had to attend to sacrifices in the midst of his pressing duties relating to war and judicial administration. A sacrificial error was not a trivial matter, especially in the ancient realm of the Kurus, which was the citadel of Brāhmaṇic ritualism. To religious indiscretions were soon added natural calamities and the effect on the people was disastrous. Mention has already been made of the Purāṇic tradition about the destruction of Hāstinapura by the erosive action of the Ganges. The *Chhāndogya Upanishad* refers to the devastation of the crops in the Kuru country by *Maṭachi* (hail-stones or locusts) and the enforced migration of the family of Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa, who repaired to the village of an unnamed noble or wealthy man, next to a neighbourly prince and ultimately to the court of Janaka of Videha.[5]

[1] XV. 16. 10-13.

[2] Trivedi's translation, pp. 322-23.

[3] Gaupālāyana also held the important post of the *Sthapati* of the Kurus (*Baudh. Śr. Sūtra*, XX. 25; *Vedic Index*, 1. 128). His relationship with Śuchivṛiksha is however, not known.

[4] XV. 16 10-13.

[5] *Chhāndogya*, I. 10. 1; *Bṛihad. Upanishad*, III, 4. For earlier vicissitudes, see Ṛigveda, X. 98 (drought in the time of Śāṃtanu); Mbh. I. 94 (story of Saṁvaraṇa). The *Chhāndogya Upanishad* says: *maṭachīhateshu Kurushu āṭikyā*

The *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*[1] affords a clue to the royal seat of the 'Ābhipratāriṇa' branch of the Kuru family whose reign witnessed the beginning of those incidents that spelled disaster to the Kurus. We are told that Dṛiti, apparently the priest of king Abhipratārin, son of Kakshasena, completed a sacrifice in Khāṇḍava.[2] The same Brāhmaṇa[3] refers to the Abhipratāriṇas as the "mightiest of all their relations." The passage is significant. It suggests that the great Janamejaya was no more in the land of the living in the days of **Vbhipratarin** and his descendants, and that the line represented by the latter far outshone the other branches of the Kuru royal family. The existence of distinct offshoots of the line is clearly implied by tradition. One of them held sway in Hāstinapura and later on moved to Kauśāmbī. This is the branch mentioned in the Purāṇas. Another line reigned in Ishukāra.[4] The third and the 'mightiest' branch is, as we have seen, connected with Khāṇḍava, the far-famed region where the great epic locates the stately city of Indraprastha. The famous capital which stood close to the site of modern Delhi finds prominent mention in the *Jātakas* as the seat of a line of kings claiming to belong to the "Yuddhiṭṭhila *gotra*" (Yudhishṭhira's *gotra* or clan).

The prosperity of the Ābhipratāriṇas was short-lived. Great calamities befell the Kurus and the disintegration of the kingdom went on apace.[5] Large sections of the

sahajayayā Ushastı ha Chakrāyana ıbhya grame pradrāṇaka uvāsa "When Kuruland was devastated by hailstones or locusts, Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa repaired with his virgin wife to a magnate's village and there lived in great distress The plight of the Brāhmana and his wife offers a sad contrast to the condition of the Kauravya and his lady who "throve merrily in the realm of Parikshit." Commentators took *matachi* to mean 'thunderbolt', 'hailstone' or 'a kind of small red bird' or 'locust.' The last meaning accords with the evidence of the *Devībhāgavatam*, X, 13. 110. *maṭachī-yūthavat teshāṁ samudayāstu nirgatāḥ*. The Kanarese word *midiche* has the same sense (Kittel's Dictionary; Jacob, *Scraps from Shaddarśana*, JRAS, 1911, 510; *Vedic Index*, II, 119; Bhand. *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, 26-27; Bagchi, *IHQ*, 1933, 253).

[1] XXV. 3. 6. [2] XIV. 1. 12.

[3] II. 9. 4, Caland's. ed., p. 27. [4] SBE., xlv. 62.

[5] Cf. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, III. 156; JAOS, 26. 61. "When Abhipratāraṇa was lying used up with old age his sons divided the inheritance and made a great noise about it.

people, including Brāhmaṇas and princes, were apparently forced to leave the country, and to migrate to the eastern part of India. The transference of the royal seat of one branch of the Kuru or Bharata dynasty to Kauśāmbī is confirmed by the evidence of some of the plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī, is described in the *Svapnavāsava-datta* as a scion of the Bharata or Bhārata family[1]: —

Bhāratānāṁ kule jāto vinīto jñānavāñchhuchiḥ
tan nārhasi balāddhartuṁ rājadharmasya deśikaḥ

"Thou art born in the family of the Bharatas. Thou art self-controlled, enlightened and pure. To stop her by force is unworthy of thee, who shouldst be the model of kingly duty."

GENEALOGY OF THE PĀRIKSHITA FAMILY

Parikshit

Janamejaya	Kakshasena	Ugrasena	S'rutasena	Bhimasena	Others
S'atanika	**Abhipratārin**			possibly identical with the ancestor of epic heroes acc. to one tradition, Mbh, 95 i. 42 ff.	
As'vamedhadatta	Vriddhadyumna				
Adhisima-krishna	Rathagritsa				
Nichakshu					
Kings of Kausambī (Puranic tradition)	Kings of Khāndava (Indapatta) ?				

[1] Ed Gaṇapati Śāstri, p. 140, Trans. V. S. Sukthankar, p. 79. *Cf. Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa*, "*Vedākshara-samavāya-pravishṭo Bhārato Vaṁśaḥ*" "*Bharatakulopabhuktaṁ vīṇāratnam,*" Act II

Bhāratānāṁ kule jāto
Vatsānāmūrjitaḥ patiḥ, Act IV.

SECTION II. THE AGE OF THE GREAT JANAKA.

Sarve rājño Maithilasya Mainākasyeva parvatāḥ nikṛishṭabhūtā rājāno..... .. ..

—*Mahābhārata.*[1]

We have seen that a series of calamities sadly crippled the Kurus. The kingdom fell to pieces and one of the princes had to leave the country. During the age which followed the Kuru people played a minor part in politics

The most notable figure of the succeeding age was **Janaka,** the great philosopher-king of Videha, mentioned in the Vedic texts as the contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. The waning power of the Kurus and the waxing strength of the Vaidehas are shown by the fact that while Kuru princes are styled *rājan* (king) in certain *Brāhmaṇas,*[2] Janaka of Videha is called *samrāṭ* (supreme king). In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] the *samrāj* is asserted to be of higher dignity than a *rājan.*

That the great Janaka was later than the Pārikshitas admits of no doubt. We shall show later on that he was a contemporary probably of Nichakshu (if Purāṇic tradition is to be accepted), and certainly of Ushasta or Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa during whose time disaster befell the Kurus. In Janaka's time we find the notable achievements, as well as the mysterious fate, of the Pārikshitas, still fresh in the memory of the people and discussed as a subject of general curiosity in the royal court of Mithilā. In the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad* Bhujyu Lāhyāyani tests Yājñavalkya, the ornament of the court of Janaka, with a question, the solution of which the former is said to have previously

[1] III. 134. 5. As all other mountains are inferior to Maināka so are kings inferior to the lord of Mithilā.

[2] *Ait.,* VIII. 14. *Pañchaviṁśa,* XIV. 1. 12. etc.

[3] V, I, 1, 12-13.

obtained from a being of superhuman power through the medium of a Madra girl:

"*Kva Pārikshitā abhavan*[1]—whither have the Pārikshitas gone?"

Yājñavalkya answers: "Thither where the performers of the horse sacrifice abide." From this it is clear that the Pārikshitas (sons of Parikshit) must at that time have passed away. Yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people, and a subject of absorbing interest to men and women in different parts of the country.[2]

It is not possible to determine with precision the exact chronological relation between Janamejaya and Janaka. Epic and Purāṇic tradition seems to regard them as contemporaries. Thus the *Mahābhārata* says that Uddālaka, a prominent figure of Janaka's court, and his son Śvetaketu, attended the *sarpa-satra* (snake-sacrifice) of Janamejaya:—

Sadasya śchābhavad Vyāsaḥ putra-śishya-sahāyavān
Uddālakaḥ Pramatakaḥ Śvetaketuścha Piṅgalaḥ[3]

"Vyāsa, assisted by his son and disciple, Uddālaka, Pramataka, Śvetaketu, Piṅgala... ..officiated as *sadasya* (priest.)"

The *Vishṇu Purāṇa* says that Śatānīka, the son and successor of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya.[4]

The unreliability of the Epic and the Purāṇic tradition in this respect is proved by the evidence of the Vedic

[1] *Bṛihad. Upanishad*, III. 3.1, E. Roer, *Bṛhad. Up.* P. 20.

[2] Weber, *Ind. Lit.* 126 ff. In the *Journal of Indian History*, April, 1936, p. 20, edited by Dr. S Krishnasvami Aiyangar and others, appears the amazing insinuation that "Mr. Roy Choudhury has attempted to give Weber's thought and language (as rendered) out as his *own, without any reference* to Weber." A perusal of the *Bibliographical Index* (pp. 319, 328) appended to the first ed. of the *Political History* and p. 27 of the text; the foreword to the subsequent editions, etc., will throw interesting light on the veracity of the writer of the article in question in the *Journal of Indian History*.

[3] *Mbh., Ādi.*, 53. 7.

[4] *Vishṇu P.*, IV. 21. 2.

texts. We learn from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[1] that Indrota Daivāpa or Daivāpi Śaunaka was a contemporary of Janamejaya. His pupil was Dṛiti Aindrota or Aindroti according to the *Jaiminīya Upanishad* and *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇas*. Dṛiti's pupil was Pulusha Prāchīnayoga.[2] The latter taught Paulushi Satyayajña. We learn from the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[3] that Paulushi Satyayajña was a contemporary of Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi and of Uddālaka Āruṇi, two prominent figures of Janaka's court.[4] Satyayajña was, therefore, certainly a contemporary of Janaka of Videha. He was an elder contemporary because his pupil Somaśushma Sātyayajñi Prāchīnayogya is mentioned in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[5] as having met Janaka. As Sātyayajñi certainly flourished long after Indrota Daivāpi Śaunaka, his contemporary Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya, the contemporary of Indrota.

We should also note that in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, and the sixth chapter of the *Bṛihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad* Tura Kāvasheya, the priest of Janamejaya, appears as a very ancient sage who was tenth in the ascending line from Sāñjīvīputra, whereas Yājñavalkya and Uddālaka Āruṇi, the contemporaries of Janaka, were only fourth and fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher. The lists are given below:—

Janamejaya. Tura Kāvasheya

Yajñavachas Rājastambāyana		
Kuśri	Kuśri Vājaśravasa[6]	
Śāṇḍilya	Upaveśi	
Vātsya	Aruṇa	
Vāmakashāyaṇa	Uddālaka Āruṇi	Janaka
Māhitthi	Yājñavalkya	the Great

[1] XIII. 5. 4. 1.
[2] *Vedic Index*, II. p. 9.
[3] V. 11. 1 2.
[4] Vide *Bṛihad-āranyaka Upanishad*. V. 14. 18: "*Janako Vaideho Budilam Aśvatarāśvim uvācha*," and III. 7. 1.
[5] XI. 6 2. 1-3.
[6] *IC*, III. 747.

Kautsa	Āsuri
Māṇḍavya	Āsurāyaṇa
Māṇḍūkāyani	Prāśnīputra Āsurivāsin
Sāñjīvīputra	Sāñjīvīputra

It is clear from what has been stated above that Janaka was separated by five or six generations from Janamejaya's time.[1] Jacobi and Rhys Davids[2] agree in estimating the average length of a patriarchate or generation (in lists relating to spiritual succession) at 30 years. To the five or six teachers from Indrota to Somaśushma, and from Tura to Uddālaka Āruṇi and Janaka, we may, therefore, assign a period of 150 or 180 years.[3] It is, therefore, reason-

[1] It has been stated by certain writers that Janamejaya should be placed "only a step above Janaka." They point to the use of *laṅ* in the verb *bhū* in the interrogation *Kva Pārikshitā abhavan* quoted above They further identify Dantābala Dhaumra, a contemporary of Janamejaya according to a legend narrated in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, with Dantāla Dhaumya of the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, who may be assigned to the period of Janaka. It is also suggested that Bhāllaveya of a certain Brāhmaṇa passage is no other than Indradyumna, *JIH.*, April, 1936, 15 ff. etc. Apart from the fact that in the Vedic texts *laṅ* and *liṭ* are at times used alternatively to convey the same meaning (Cf 37 *ante*.) it should be noted that the question '*Kva Pārikshitā abhavan*' with its answer was not framed *for the first time* at the court of Janaka It is a *mūrdhābhishikta* (traditional)—*udāharaṇa* attributed to superhuman agency—and, therefore, *it cannot* be regarded as establishing the synchronism of Janamejaya Pārikshita and Janaka Vaideha As to Dantābala it has already been pointed out (p. 39 above), that the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* mentions Dhumras and Dhaumyas as *distinct* members of the Kaśyapa group. Janamejaya must have passed away in the days of Driti and the Ābhipratāriṇas See *ante* p. 46. See also *IHQ*, Vol. VIII, 1932. 600 ff. As to Bhāllaveya, serious students should remember that it is a patronymic like *Ātreya, Bhāradvāja* etc. In the absence of the *personal* name, it is uncritical to identify every Bhāllaveya with Indradyumna himself as it is unreasonable to equate every Ātreya with Udamaya or every Bhāradvāja with Droṇa or Piṇḍola

[2] *Pariśishta-parvan*, 2nd ed. xviii and *Buddhist Suttas* Introduction. p xlvii

[3] It has been urged by some critics that pupils are not necessarily younger in age than their preceptors. It may freely be admitted that in particular cases pupils may be of the same age with, or even older than, the *guru*. But it is idle to suggest that in a *long* list of successive *āchāryas* and *śishyas* the presence of elderly pupils must be assumed except where the *guru* is known to be the father of the pupil. Individual cases of succession of elderly *śishyas* do not invalidate the conclusion that the *average* duration of a generation is as is suggested by Jacobi and Rhys Davids.

able to think that Janaka flourished about 150 or 180 years after Janamejaya, and two centuries after Parikshit. If, following a Purāṇic tradition, we place Parikshit in the fourteenth century B.C., we must place Janaka in the twelfth century B.C. If, on the other hand, we accept a date for Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, the pupil's pupil of Uddālaka according to the *Śāṅkhāyana, Āraṇyaka,* in the sixth century B.C., we must place Parikshit in the ninth century B.C., and Janaka in the seventh century B.C.

The kingdom of **Videha,** over which Janaka ruled seems to be mentioned for the first time in the *Saṁhitās* of the *Yajur Veda.*[1] It corresponds roughly to the modern Tirhut in North Bihār.[2] It was separated from Kosala by the river Sadānīrā, usually identified with the modern Gaṇḍak which rising in Nepāl, flows into the Ganges opposite Patna.[3] Oldenberg, however, points out[4] that the *Mahābhārata* distinguishes the Gaṇḍakī from the Sadānīrā: *"Gaṇḍakīñcha Mahāśoṇaṁ Sadānīrāṁ tathaiva cha."* Pargiter, therefore, indentifies the Sadānīrā with the Rāptī.[5] We learn from the *Suruchi Jātaka*[6] that the measure of the whole kingdom of Videha was three hundred leagues. It consisted of 16,000 villages.[7]

Mithila, the capital of Videha, is not referred to in the Vedic texts, but is constantly mentioned in the *Jātakas* and the Epics. It has been identified with the small town of Janakpur just within the Nepāl border north of the place where the Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet. It is stated in the *Suruchi* and *Gandhāra*[8] *Jātakas*

[1] *Vedic Index,* II. 298.

[2] According to Pargiter, *JASB,* 1897, 89—"Videha comprised the country from Gorakhpur on the Rāptī to Darabhanga, with Kosala on the west and Aṅga on the east. On the north it approached the hills, and to the south it was bounded by the small kingdom of Vaiśālī."

[3] Vedic Index II. 299.

[4] *Buddha,* p. 398 n. Cf. Pargiter, *JASB,* 1897. 87. Mbh. II. 20. 27.

[5] If the epic enumeration of the rivers quoted above follows a geographical order as is suggested by the use of the expression *krameṇa* in the Mbh. II 20. 27, Sadānīrā may be the Burhi Gaṇḍak which is distinguished from the Gaṇḍak proper. Cf. map in JASB, 1895.

[6] J. 489.

[7] J. 406. These are apparently conventional figures.

[8] J. 489 and 406.

that the city covered seven leagues. At its four gates were four market towns.[1] We have the following description of the city in the *Mahājanaka Jātaka*[2]:—

> By architects with rule and line laid out in order fair to see,
> With walls and gates and battlements, traversed by streets on every side,
> With horses, cows and chariots thronged with tanks and gardens beautified,
> Videha's far-famed capital, gay with its knights and warrior swarms,
> Clad in their robes of tiger-skins, with banners spread and flashing arms.
> Its Brahmins dressed in Kāśi cloth, perfumed with sandal, decked with gems,
> Its palaces and all their queens with robes of state and diadems[3]

According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*[4] the **royal family of Mithila** was founded by a king named Nimi. His son was Mithi, and Mithi's son was Janaka I. The epic then continues the genealogy to Janaka II (father of Sītā) and his brother Kuśadhvaja, king of Sāṅkāśya. The *Vāyu*[5] and the *Vishnu*[6] *Purāṇas* represent Nimi or Nemi as a son of Ikshvāku, and give him the epithet Videha.[7] His son was Mithi whom both the *Purāṇas* identify with Janaka I. The genealogy is then continued to Sīradhvaja who is called the father of Sītā, and is, therefore, identical with Janaka II of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Then starting from Sīradhvaja the *Purāṇas* carry on the dynasty to its close. The last king is named Kṛiti, and the family is called *Janaka-vaṁśa*.

[1] J. 546.
[2] No. 539; Cowell's *Jātaka*, Vol. VI, p. 30
[3] For another description of Mithilā, see Mbh. III 206. 6-9.
[4] I. 71. 3.
[5] *88*. 7-8; *89*. 3-4
[6] IV 5. 1.
[7] *Sa śāpena Vaśishṭhasya Videhaḥ samapadyata*—*Vāyu P.* The story of Vaśishṭha's curse on a Videhan king is known to the *Bṛihaddevatā* (vii 59).

Dhritestu Bahulāśvo' bhūd Bahulāśva-sutaḥ Kritiḥ
tasmin santishṭhate vaṁśo Janakānāṁ mahātmanām[1]

The Vedic texts know a king of Videha named Namī Sāpya.[2] But he is nowhere represented as the founder of the dynasty of Mithilā. On the contrary, a story of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* seems to indicate that the Videhan kingdom owes its origin to **Videgha Mathava** who came from banks of the Sarasvatī.[3] We are told that the fire-god went burning along this earth from the Sarasvati towards the east, followed by Māthava and his priest, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa till he came to the river Sadānīrā which flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain, and which he did not burn over. No Brāhmaṇas went across the stream in former times, thinking "it has not been burnt over by *Agni Vaiśvānara* (the fire that burns for all men)." At that time the land to the eastward was very uncultivated, and marshy,[4] but after Māthava's arrival many Brāhmaṇas went there, and it was cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni, the Fire-god, to taste it through sacrifices. Māthava the Videgha then said to Agni, "where am I to abide?" "To the east of this river be thy abode," he replied. Even now, the writer of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* adds, this stream forms the boundary between the Kosalas and the Videhas. The name of Mithi Vaideha, the second king in the Epic and the Purāṇic lists, is reminiscent of Māthava Videgha.

If Māthava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithilā, Namī Sāpya cannot claim that distinction. The *Majjhima Nikāya*[5] and the *Nimi Jātaka* mention Makhā-

[1] *Vāyu Purāṇa* 89, 32, For Janaka as a dynastic designation see also Mbh III 133, 17; Rām. I. 67. 8. The use of the expressions *Janakānāṁ Janakaṁ* etc., does not necessarily indicate that *every* member of the line bore the personal name Janaka. Cf. *Ikshvākūṇāṃ* (*Rām.* I. 5. 3), which refers to those who were *Ikshvāku-vaṁśa-prabhavāh* (I. 1. 8); *Raghūṇām anvayam*, etc.

[2] *Vedic Index*, I, 436.

[3] Macdonell *Sans. Lit.*, pp. 214-15; *Ved., Ind.*, II. 298, *Śat. Br.*, 1. 4, 1. etc.; Oldenberg's *Buddha*, pp. 398-99; Pargiter, J.A.S.B., 1897. p. 86 *et seq.*

[4] This is the territory which the *Mahābhārata* refers to as "*Jalodbhava*" *i.e.*, reclaimed from swamp (Mbh., II. 30. 4. Pargiter, *Ibid*, 88n).

[5] II. 74-83.

deva as the progenitor of the kings of Mithilā, and a Nimi is said to have been born to "round off the royal house, the family of hermits." The evidence of Buddhist texts thus shows that the name Nimi was borne not by the first, but probably by some later king or kings.[1]

As the entire dynasty of Maithila monarchs was called *Janaka-vaṁśa, Vaṁśo Janakānāṁ mahātmanām,* the family of the high-souled Janakas, in post-Vedic literature, and there were several kings bearing the name of Janaka, it is very difficult to identify any of these with the great **Janaka** of the Vedic texts, the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājña-valkya. But there is one fact which seems to favour his identification with Sīradhvaja of the Purāṇic list, *i e*, the father of Sītā. The father of the heroine of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is a younger contemporary of Aśvapati, king of the Kekayas (maternal grandfather of Bharata[2]), Janaka of the Vedic texts is also a contemporary of Aśvapati, prince of the Kekayas, as Uddālaka Āruṇi and Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi frequented the courts of both these princes.[3] But as the name Aśvapati is also apparently given to Bharata's maternal uncle,[4] it seems that it was possibly not a personal name but a secondary epithet or a family designation like 'Janaka.'[5] In that case it is impossible to say how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā is correct. The identification seems, however, to have been accepted by Bhavabhūti. Referring to the father of the heroine, the poet says in the *Mahāvīra-charita*[6]:

Teshāmidānīṃ dāyādo
vṛiddhaḥ Sīradhvajo nṛipaḥ

[1] The evidence of the *Bṛihad-devatā* (vii. 59) suggests that connection was maintained by Videhan monarchs with their old home on the banks of the Sarasvatī, cf. *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmana,* XXV 10. 16-18 (story of Namī Sāpya).

[2] *Rāmāyaṇa,* II. 9. 22.

[3] Ved. Ind., II, 69; Chh. Up. V. 11. 1-4; Bṛih. Up., III. 7.

[4] *Rāmāyaṇa,* VII. 113. 4.

[5] Against the view that Aśvapati was a family designation common to all members of the line it may, however, be urged that in the Mbh. vii. 104 7; 123. 5 Bṛihatkshatra, chief of the Kekayas, does not bear that epithet.

[6] Act I, Verse 14.

Yājñavalkyo munir yasmai
Brahmapārāyaṇaṁ jagau.[1]

It is equally difficult to identify our Janaka with any of the kings of that name mentioned in the Buddhist *Jātakas*. Professor Rhys Davids[2] seems to identify him with Mahā-Janaka of the *Jātaka* No. 539. The utterance of Mahā-Janaka II of that Jātaka.

'Mithilā's palaces may burn
But naught of mine is burned thereby

indeed reminds us of the great philosopher-king.

In the *Mahābhārata*[3] we find the saying attributed to Janaka 'Janadeva' of Mithilā. In the Jaina *Uttar-ādhyayana*, however, the saying is attributed to Namī.[4] This fact coupled with the mention of Nemi in juxtaposition with Arishṭa in the *Vishṇu-Purāṇa*[5] may point to the identification of Namī or Nemi with Mahā-Janaka II whom the *Jātaka* represents as the son of Ariṭṭha. If Mahā-Janaka II be identical with Namī, he cannot be identified with Janaka who is clearly distinguished from Namī in the Vedic texts. One may be tempted to identify the Vedic Janaka with Mahā-Janaka I of the *Jātaka*. But proof is lacking.

In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka*

[1] *Cf.* Act II. verse 43; *Uttara-Charita*. Act IV, verse 9. In the Mbh III 133.4 the contemporary of Uddālaka and Kahoḍa seems to be called Aindradyumni. (Cf. *AIHT*. 96.) In Mbh. XII. 310 4, 3. 8. 95, the contemporary of Yājñavalkya is styled Daivarāti. *The Śatapatha Brāhmana* is attributed to this Yājñavalkya (*ibid*, XII. 318. 11f). Both Aindradyumni and Daivarāti are patronymics and hardly afford a clue to the personal name of the king in question.

[2] Bud. Ind., P. 26.

[3] XII. 17. 18-19; 219, 50

"Mithilāyāṁ pradīptāyāṁ
na me dahyati kiñchana"
"Api cha bhavati Maithilena gītaṁ
nagaram upāhitam agninābhivīkshya
na khalu mama hi dahyate' tra kiñchit
swayam idam āha kila sma bhūmipālaḥ"

"Seeing his city burning in a fire, the king of Mithilā himself sang of old, 'in this (conflagration) nothing of mine is burning'."

[4] S. B. E., XLV. 37.

[5] IV. 5. 13.

Upanishad and the *Mahābhārata*[1] Janaka is called *Samrāṭ*. This shows that he was a greater personage than a mere *Rājan*. Although there is no clear evidence in the Vedic literature of the use of the word *Samrāj* as emperor in the sense of a king of kings, still the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* distinctly says that the *Samrāj* was a higher authority than a *Rājan*; "by offering the *Rājasūya* he becomes king, and by the *Vājapeya* he becomes *Samrāj*; and the office of king is the lower, and that of *Samrāj* the higher."[2] In the *Āśvalāyana Śrauta-Sūtra*[3] Janaka is mentioned as a great sacrificer.

But Janaka's fame rests not so much on his achievements as a king and a sacrificer, as on his patronage of culture and philosophy. The court of this monarch was thronged with Brāhmaṇas from Kosala, the Kuru-Pañchāla countries and perhaps Madra, *e.g.*, Aśvala, Jāratkārava Ārtabhāga, Bhujyu Lāhyāyani, Ushasta(-i) Chākrāyaṇa, Kahoḍa Kaushītakeya. Gārgī Vāchaknavī, Uddālaka Āruṇi and Vidagdha Śākalya. The tournaments of argument which were here held form a prominent feature in the third book of the *Bṛihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad*. The hero of these was Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, who was a pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇi.[4] Referring to Janaka's relations with the Kuru-Pañchāla Brāhmaṇas, Oldenberg observes:[5] "The king of the east, who has a leaning to the culture of the west, collects the celebrities of the west at his court—much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the court of Macedonian princes."

The *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads* throw some light on the political **condition of Northern India** during the age of the great Janaka. From those works we learn that besides Videha, there were nine states of considerable importance, *viz.*:

[1] III. 133 17.
[2] *Śat. Br.*, V, 1. 1. 12-13: XII, 8. 3. 4; XIV, 1, 3, 8.
[3] X. 3 14.
[4] *Bṛih. Up.* VI. 5. 3.
[5] *Buddha*, P. 398.

1. Gandhāra	4. Uśīnara	7. Pañchāla
2. Kekaya	5. Matsya	8. Kāśi
3. Madra	6. Kuru	9. Kosala

The Vedic texts seldom furnish any definite clue as to the exact geographical position of these states. For the location of most of these territories we must, therefore, turn to the evidence of later literature.

The inhabitants of **Gandhara** are included by epic poets among the peoples of *Uttarāpatha* or the northernmost region of India: —

Uttarāpatha-janmānaḥ kīrtayishyāmi tān api
Yauna-Kāmboja-Gāndhārāḥ Kirātā Barbaraiḥ saha.[1]

The country lay on both sides of the Indus,[2] and contained two great cities, *viz.*, Takshaśilā and Pushkarāvatī, alleged to have been founded by two heroes of epic fame:

Gandhāra-vishaye siddhe, tayoḥ puryau mahātmanoh
Takshasya dikshu vikhyātā ramyā Takshaśilā purī
Pushkarasyāpi vīrasya vikhyātā Pushkarāvatī.[3]

The *vishaya* (territory) described in these lines must have embraced the Rāwalpindi district of the Western Pañjāb and the Peshāwar district of the North-West Frontier Province. A few miles to the north-west of Rāwalpindī and 2,000 leagues away from Banaras,[4] stood the famous city of Takshaśilā or Taxila. The remains of the great city "are situated immediately to the east and north-east of

[1] *Mbh.*, XII. 207. 43.

[2] *Rāmāyaṇa*, VII. 113. 11; 114. 11; *Sindhor-ubhayataḥ pārśve*. According to *Jātaka* No. 406 the kingdom of Gandhāra included Kaśmīra. Hekataios of Miletus (B. C. 549-486) refers to a Gandaric city called Kaspapyros. Stein (*JASB*, 1899, extra No. 2, 11) equates Kaspapyros with Kaspatyros of Herodotus and says that it must have been situated in that territory where the Indus first becomes navigable, *i.e.*, in the ancient Gandhāra. Kaspatyros was the place at which the expedition under Skylax, sent by Darius to explore the course of the Indus, embarked. Stein (pp. 12-13) rejects the view according to which Kaspapyros represents the Sanskrit Kaśyapapura from which the name Kaśmīr is said to have been derived. Kāśyapapura as a place-name is known to Alberuni (1 298), but he mentions it as an original designation of Multan. Kaśyapa's traditional connection with Kaśmīr is, however, clear from *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 1, 27.

[3] *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 88. 189-90. *cf.* *Rāmāyaṇa*, VII. 114 11.

[4] *Telapatta* and *Susīma Jātakas*, Nos. 96, 163.

To face page 54

Sarai-kala, a junction on the railway, twenty miles north-west of Rāwalpindī. The valley in which they lie is watered by the Haro river. Within this valley and within three and a half miles of each other are the remains of three distinct cities. The southernmost (and oldest) of these occupies an elevated plateau, known locally as Bhir-mound."[1]

Pushkarāvatī or Pushkalāvatī, the Lotus City, (Prākrit *Pukkalāoti,* whence the 'Peukelaotis' of Arrian) is represented by the modern Prang and Chārsadda, 17 miles north-east of Peshāwar, on the Swāt river.[2]

Gandhāra is a later form of the name of the people called Gandhāri in the *Ṛig-Veda* and *Atharva-Veda.* In the *Ṛig-Veda*[3] the good wool of the sheep of these tribesmen is referred to. In the *Atharva-Veda*[4] the Gandhāris are mentioned with the Mūjavats, apparently as a despised people. The *Brāhmaṇa* texts refer to Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and his son Svarjit. The former receives Brāhmaṇic consecration, but observations of the family on ritual are treated with contempt.[5] In later times the 'angle of vision' of the men of the *Madhya-deśa* (Mid-India) changed, and Gandhāra became a resort of scholars of all classes who flocked to its capital for instruction in the three *Vedas* and the eighteen[6] branches of knowledge.

In a significant passage of the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[7] Uddālaka Āruṇi, the contemporary of the Vedic Janaka, mentions Gandhāra to illustrate the desirability of having a duly qualified teacher from whom a pupil "learns (his way)

[1] Marshall, *A Guide to Taxila,* pp. 1-4; *AGI,* 1924, 120, 128 f.

[2] Schoff. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea,* pp. 183-84; Foucher, *Notes on the Ancient Geography of Gandhāra,* p. 11; *cf* V. A. Smith, JASB, 1889, 111; Cunningham, *AGI,* 1924. 57 f. Strabo (XV. 26) extends Gandaritis westwards to the Choaspes (Kunar ?).

[3] I. 126. 7.

[4] V, 22, 14. cf. *Mbh.* VIII, 44. 46; 45. 8 etc.

[5] *Aitareya,* vii. 34. *Śatapatha,* viii, 1, 4. 10. *Vedic Index,* i. 432.

[6] Cf. Rhys Davids and Stede, *Pali-English Dictionary,* 76 (*Vijja-ṭṭhānāni*); *Vāyu, 61, 79. Brahmāṇḍa 67,* 82; *Milinda* I. 9. mentions 19 *Sippas;* cf. IV, 3. 26.

[7] VI. 14.

and thus remains liberated (from all worldly ties) till he attains (the Truth or Beatitude, *Moksha*)." A man who attains *Moksha* is compared to a blindfold person who reaches at last the country of Gandhāra. The passage runs as follows:

"*Yathā somya purushaṁ Gandharebhyo'bhinaddh-āksham ānīya taṁ tato'tijane visṛijet, sa yathātatra prāṅ vā udaṅ vādharāṅ vā pratyaṅ vā pradhmāyīta—abhinad-dhāksha ānīto' bhinaddhāksho visṛishṭaḥ. Tasya yathā-bhinahanaṁ pramuchya prabrūyād etāṁ diśaṁ Gandhārā etāṁ diśaṁ vrajeti. Sa grāmād grāmaṁ pṛichchhan paṇḍito medhāvī Gandhārān evopasampadyeta, evam eveh-āchāryavān purusho veda.*"

"O my child, in the world when a man with blindfold eyes is carried away from Gandhāra and left in a lonely place, he makes the east and the north and the south and the west resound by crying 'I have been brought here blind-fold, I am here left blindfold.' Thereupon (some kind-hearted man) unties the fold on his eyes and says 'This is the way to Gandhāra; proceed thou by this way.' The sensible man proceeds from village to village enquiring the way and reaches at last the (province) of Gandhāra. Even thus a man who has a duly qualified teacher learns (his way)."[1]

The full import of the illustration becomes apparent when we remember that the *Uddālaka Jātaka*[2] represents Uddālaka as having journeyed to Takshaśilā (Takkaśilā) and learnt there of a world-renowned teacher. The Setaketu Jātaka[3] says that Śvetaketu, son of Uddālaka, went to Takshaśilā and learned all the arts. The *Śata-patha Brāhmaṇa* mentions the fact that Uddālaka Āruṇi used to drive about amongst the people of the northern country.[4] It is stated in the *Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa*[5] that

[1] *Cf.* Dr. R. L. Mitra's translation of the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*, v. 114.
[2] No. 487.
[3] No. 377.
[4] *Śat. Br.* XI. 4. 1. 1, *et seq. Udīchyānvṛito dhāvayāṁchakāra.*
VII 6 *Vedic Index*, II. 279.

Brāhmaṇas used to go to the north for purposes of study. The *Jātaka* tales are full of references to the fame of Takshaśilā as a university town. Pāṇini, himself a native of Gandhāra, refers to the city in one of his *Sūtras*.[1] An early celebrity of Takshaśilā was perhaps Kauṭilya.[2]

The **Kekayas** were settled in the Western Pañjab between Gandhāra and the Beas. From the *Rāmāyaṇa*[3] we learn that the Kekaya territory lay beyond the Vipāśā or Beas and abutted on the Gandharva or Gandhāra *Vishaya*. The Mahābhārata[4] associates them with the Madras (*Madrāścha saha Kekayaiḥ*). Arrian[5] places the "Kekians" on the river Saranges, apparently a tributary of the Hydraotes or the Rāvi.

The Vedic texts do not mention the name of its capital city, but the *Rāmāyaṇa* informs us that the metropolis was Rājagṛiha or Girivraja:

"Ubhau Bharata-Śatrughnau Kekayeshu parantapau,
pure Rājagṛihe ramye mātāmaha-niveśane."[6]

"Both Bharata and Satrughna, repressers of enemies, are staying in Kekaya in the charming city of Rājagṛiha, the abode of (the) maternal grandfather (of the former)."

"Girivrajaṁ puravaraṁ śīghram āsedur añjasā".[7]

"(The messengers bound for Kekaya) quickly arrived at Girivraja, the best of cities."

The journey from Ayodhyā to the Kekaya capital, a distance of about 650 miles, took seven days. Videha could be reached from Ayodhyā on the fourth day. The distance is about 200 miles. The slower rate is explained by Pargiter by absence of good roads. Cunningham identifies the capital of the Kekayas with Girjak or Jalalpur on the river Jhelam.[8]

[1] *Sūtra* iv. 3. 93. AGI (1924), 67.
[2] Turnour, *Mahawanso*, vol. I (1837), p. xxxix.
[3] II. 68. 19-22; VII. 113-14.
[4] VI. 61. 12; VII. 19. 7. *Madra-Kekayāḥ*.
[5] *Indika*, iv; *Ind. Ant.* V. 332; Mc Crindle *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, pp. 163, 196.
[6] Rām., II. 67. 7.
[7] Rām., II. 68. 22.
[8] Rām., I. 69, 7; II. 71. 18. *AGI*, 1924, 188; *JASB*, 1895, 250 ff.

There was another Rājagṛiha-Girivraja in Magadha, while Hiuen Tsang mentions a third Rājagṛiha in Po-ho or Balkh.[1] In order to distinguish between the Kekaya city and the Magadhan capital, the latter city was called "Girivraja of the Magadhas."[2]

The *Purāṇas*[3] tell us that the Kekayas along with the Madrakas and the Uśīnaras, were branches of the family of Anu, son of Yayāti. The Anu tribe is frequently mentioned in the *Ṛig-Veda*.[4] It appears from a hymn of the eighth *Maṇḍala*[5] that they dwelt in the Central Pañjab, not far from the Parushṇī, the same territory which we find afterwards in possession of the Kekayas and the Madrakas.

The king of Kekaya in the time of the Vedic Janaka was Aśvapati, a name borne also by the maternal grandfather and maternal uncle of Bharata.[6] The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[7] and the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[8] suggest that the Kekaya monarch was a man of learning and that he instructed a number of Brāhmaṇas, *viz.* Aruṇa Aupaveśi Gautama, Satyayajña Paulushi, Mahāśāla Jābāla, Buḍila, Āśvatarāśvi, Indradyumna Bhāllaveya, Jana Śārkarākshya, Prāchīnaśāla Aupamanyava, and Uddālaka Āruṇi. The reference to Aruṇa Aupaveśi who belongs to an older generation than Uddālaka, shows that Aśvapati was an elder contemporary of the great philosopher-king of Videha.

The Jaina writers tell us that one-half of the kingdom of Kekaya was Aryan, and refer to the Kekaya city called "Seyaviyā".[9] A branch of Kekayas seems to have migrated to Southern India in later times and established its authority in the Mysore country.[10]

The **Madra** people were divided into several sections *viz.*, the northern Madras, the eastern Madras, the southern

[1] Beal, *Si-yu ki*, Vol. 1, p. 44.
[2] S. B. E., XIII, p. 150.
[3] *Matsya*, 48. 10-20; *Vāyu*, 99. 12-23
[4] I. 108. 8, VII. 18. 14, VIII. 10. 5
[5] 74.
[6] Rām. II. 9, 22, VII 113. 4.
[7] X. 6. 1. 2.
[8] V. 11. 4. *et seq.*
[9] *Ind. Ant.*, 1891, p. 375.
[10] *A.H.D.*, 88, 101.

Madras or Madras proper etc. The northern Madras known as Uttara-Madras, are referred to in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,* as living beyond the Himavat range in the neighbourhood of the Uttara-Kurus, possibly, as Zimmer and Macdonell conjecture, in the land of Kaśmīr. The eastern Madras probably occupied some district to the east of Siālkot, not far from Trigartta or Kangra.[1]

The southern Madras were settled in the Central Pañjab in the territory lying to the west of the river Irāvatī or Rāvi.[2] In later times the eastern limits extended to the Amritsar district which was included within the Madradeśa in the days of Guru Govind Singh.[3] The ancient capital (properly *puṭa-bhedana*) was Śākala or Sāgala-nagara (modern Śiālkot). This city is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*[4] and several *Jātakas*[5] and is probably hinted at in the name 'Śākalya,' given to a Vedic teacher who graced the court of Janaka. It stood on the banks of the Āpagā[6] in a tongue of land between two rivers styled the Śākala-dvīpa,[7] apparently corresponding to a part of the Rechna Doāb.

The Madras proper are represented in early post-Vedic works as living under a monarchical constitution. The name of the ruler of the territory in the time of Janaka is not known. It was politically not of much importance. But, like the northern realms described above, it was the home of many famous scholars and teachers of the *Brāhmaṇa* period such as Madragāra Śauṅgāyani and Kāpya Patañchala,[8] one of the teachers of the celebrated Uddālaka Āruṇi.[9] The early epic knows

[1] Pāṇini, IV. 2. 107-8; Cf. Association of Mādras and Trigarttas, Mbh VI 61. 12. In I. 121. 56 the number of 'Madras' is given as *four.*

[2] *Cf., Mbh.,* VIII. 44. 17.

[3] Malcolm, *Sketch of the Sikhs,* p. 55.

[4] II. 32. 14. *Tataḥ Śākalamabhyetya Madrāṇām puṭabhedanam.*

[5] *E. g. Kāliṅgabodhi Jātaka,* No. 479; and *Kusa Jātaka,* No. 531.

[6] Bbh. VIII. 44. 10; Cunn. *AGI,* 1924, 211 f. Cunningham identifies this Āpagā with the Ayak rivulet which rises in the Jammu hills and joins the Chenāb.

[7] *Mbh.* II. 26. 5.

[8] Weber, *Ind. Lit.,* 126.

[9] *Bṛihad, Up.,* III. 7. 1.

the Madra royal house[1] as a virtuous family. But in later times Madra earned notoriety as the seat of outlandish peoples with wicked customs.[2]

The country of the **Usinaras** was situated in the *Madhya-deś* or Mid-India. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[3] says *"asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratishṭhāyāṁ diśi,"* "in this firmly established middle region," lie the realms of the Kuru-Pañchālas together with Vaśas and Uśīnaras. In the *Kaushītaki Upanishad* also the Uśīnaras are associated with the Matsyas, the Kuru-Pañchālas and the Vaśas. They probably lived in the northernmost part of the *Madhya-deśa,* for in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* the Uśīnaras and the Vaśas are mentioned just before the *Udīchyas* or northerners:[4] *Kuru-Pañchāleshu Aṅga-Magadheshu Kāśi-Kausalyeshu Śālva-Matsyeshu sa Vaśa Uśīnaresh-ūdīchyeshu.*

The *Mahābhārata* speaks of 'Uśīnara' as sacrificing on two small streams near the Jumna.[5] In the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* Usīnara giri is placed near Kanakhala, the "sanctifying place of pilgrimage at the point where the Ganges issues from the hills."[6] It is, doubtless, identical with Usira-giri of the *Divyāvadāna*[7] and Usira-dhvaja of the *Vinaya* Texts.[8] Pāṇini refers to the Uśīnara country in several *sūtras.*[9] Its capital was Bhoja-nagara.[10]

[1] *Cf.* Aśvapati and his daughter Sāvitrī.

[2] For detailed accounts of the Madras see Dr. H. C. Ray in *JASB*, 1922, 257, and Law, *Some Ksatriya Tribes of Ancient India*, p. 214. Mr S. N. Mitra points out that the *Paramattha-dīpanī* on the *Therīgāthā* (p. 127) (wrongly) places Sāgala-nagara in Magadha-rattha. But the *Apadāna* quotations on p. 131 leave no room for doubt that Madra is the correct name of the kingdom of which Sāgala (Śākala) was the capital

[3] VIII. 14.

[4] *Gop. Br.* II. 9.

[5] *Mbh. III.* 130. 21.

[6] Edited by Pandit Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāndurang Parab, third edition, p. 5. Kanakhala stands near Hardwar in the Saharanpur district of the Uttara Pradesh. *Cf.* also *Mbh.* V. 111. 16-23.

[7] P. 22.

[8] Part II, p. 39. See Hultzsch, *Ind. Ant.*, 1905, p. 179.

[9] II. 4. 20; IV. 2. 118.

[10] *Mbh.*, V. 118. 2. For Ahvara, a fortress of the Uśīnaras, see *Ind. Ant.* 1885, 322.

The *Ṛig-Veda*[1] mentions a queen named Uśīnarāṇī. The *Mahābhārata*, the *Anukramaṇī* and several *Jātakas* mention a king named Uśīnara and his son Śibi.[2] We do not know the name of Janaka's Uśīnara contemporary. The *Kaushītaki Upanishad* tells us that Gārgya Bālāki, a contemporary of Ajātaśatru of Kāsi, and of Janaka of Videha, lived for some time in the Uśīnara country.

Matsya is usually taken to "include parts of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur," being "the kingdom of the king Virāṭa of the *Mahābhārata*, in whose court the five Pāṇḍava brothers resided *incognito* during the last year of their banishment."[3] But Alwar seems to have been the territory of a neighbouring people—the Sālvas.[4] The Matsya country lay to the south of the Kurus of the Delhi region and to the west of the Śūrasenas of Mathurā. Southward it may have approached the river Chambal, westward it reached the Sarasvatī. The Mahābhārata mentions a people called the Apara-Matsyas whom Pargiter places on the hill tracts on the north bank of the Chambal. The Rāmāyaṇa has a reference to the Vīra-Matsyas in connection with the Sarasvatī and the Ganges.[5] The Matsya-capital has been identified by Cunningham[6] with Bairat in the Jaipur State. Pargiter thinks[7] that the capital was

[1] X. 59. 10.

[2] *Mbh.*, XII. 29. 39; *Vedic Index*, Vol I, p. 103; *Mahā-Kanha Jātaka*, No 469, *Nimi Jātaka*, No. 541 *Mahā Nārada Kassapa Jātaka*, No 544 etc

[3] Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, p. 53.

[4] *Cf Ind Ant.*, 1919 N. L. Dey's *Geographical Dictionary*, p ii

[5] Mbh. II. 31. 2-7; III. 24-25; IV. 5.4; Rām. II. 71.5. Pargiter points out (JASB, 1895, 250 ff.) that the Matsya Country lay southward from Khāṇḍava-prastha (Delhi region). Its position to the west of Śūrasena (Mathurā district) is brought out clearly by the description of the journey of the Pāṇḍu princes to the court of Virāṭa. Crossing the Jumna the heroes passed through the territory, north of the Daśārnas and south of the Pañchālas and then proceeded through the countries of the Yakrillomas and the Śūrasenas to the Matsya realm. From Upaplavya, a suburb of the Matsya capital, to Hāstinapura, the metropolis of the Kurus in the epic age, was less than two days' journey by chariot. Vṛikasthala on the way could be reached by a traveller in the evening on the first day.

[6] *AGI.* 1924, 387; *I. A. V.* 179. *For a Virāṭa-nagara in South India*, see *Bomb. Gaz.* I. ii, 558.

[7] JASB, 1895, 252.

Upaplavya. But according to Nīlakaṇṭha, the commentator, Upaplavya was *"Virāṭa-nagara-samīpastha-nagarāntaram,"* a city close to the metropolis, but not identical with it.[1]

The Matsyas first appear in a passage of the *Ṛig-Veda*[2] where they are ranged with the other antagonists of Sudās, the great Ṛigvedic conqueror. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] mentions a Matsya king named Dhvasan Dvaitavana who celebrated a horse-sacrifice near the Sarasvatī. The *Brāhmaṇa* quotes the following *gāthā* (song): —

Chaturdaśa Dvaitavano rājā saṁgrāmajidd-hayān
Indrāya Vṛitraghne' badhnāttasmād Dvaitavanaṁ sara(iti).

'Fourteen steeds did king Dvaitavana, victorious in battle, bind for Indra Vṛitrahan, whence the lake Dvaitavana (took its name)". The *Mahābhārata* mentions the lake as well as a forest called Dvaitavana which spread over the banks of the river Sarasvatī.[4]

In the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*[5] the Matsyas appear in connexion with the Śālvas, in the *Kaushītaki Upanishad*[6] in connexion with the Kuru-Pañchālas, and in the *Mahābhārata* in connexion with the Trigarttas[7] of the Jālandar Doāb, and the Chedis of Central India.[8] In the *Manu-Saṁhitā*[9] the Matsyas together with Kuru-kshetra, the Pañchālas, and the Śūrasenakas comprise the holy enclave of the Brāhmaṇa sages (*Brahmarshi-deśa*).

The name of Janaka's contemporary ruler is not known. That the country was important in the time of the great philosopher-king of Videha, is known from the *Kaushītaki Upanishad.*

[1] Mbh. IV. 72. 14. *Cf. Ind. Ant.*, 1882, 327.
[2] VII. 18.6
[3] XIII. 5.4.9.
[4] Mbh. III. 24-25.
[5] I. 2. 9.
[6] IV. 1.
[7] Mbh., Bk, IV. 30-1-2; 32-1-2.
[8] V. 74. 16.
[9] II. 19.

The Kuru country tried to maintain its reputation as a home of Brāhmaṇical culture in the age of Janaka. But scholars hailing from that region appear now in the role of students thirsting for philosophical knowledge rather than authorities on sacrificial ritual. This probably points to a new development in the social life of the people, a development that synchronises with the end of the period of prosperity under Parikshit and his immediate successors and the beginning of economic distress hinted at in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*.[1] The time was soon to come when they would listen even to the heterodox teaching of new faiths that grew up in Eastern India. For the present Kuru Brāhmaṇas (*e.g.*, Ushasti Chākrāyaṇa) took an active part in discussions about *Brahman* and *ātman* at the court of Videha. The intellectual life of the eastern kingdom must have been greatly stirred by the exodus of Kurus and perhaps also of the Pañchālas that took place about this time An exodus from Constantinople in a like manner enriched the life of the people of western Europe in the fifteenth century A.D.

If the Purāṇic list of Janamejaya's successors be accepted as historical, then it would appear that Nichakshu was probably the Kuru king of Hāstinapura in the time of Janaka.

1.	Janamejaya ...	1.	Indrota Daivāpa Saunaka.
2.	Śatānīka ...	2.	Dṛiti Aindrota (son and pupil)
3	Aśva-medha-datta	3.	Pulusha Prāchīnayogya (pupil)
4.	Adhisīma-kṛishna	4.	Pulushi Satyayajña (pupil)
5.	Nichakshu ...	5.	Somaśushma Sātyayajñi (pupil); Janaka's contemporary.

Curiously enough, it is Nichakshu who is represented in the *Purāṇas* as the remover of the seat of government from Hāstinapura to Kauśāmbī. We have some indication that the city of Kauśāmbī really existed about this time.[2] The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* makes Proti Kauśāmbeya

[1] 1. 10. 1-7.
[2] *Cf. Weber, Ind. Lit.*, p. 123; *Vedic Index*, I. 193.

a contemporary of Uddālaka Āruṇi who figured in the court of Janaka. It is thus clear that Kauśāmbeya was a contemporary of Janaka. Now, Harisvāmin in his commentary on the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* understood Kauśāmbeya to mean a 'native of the town of Kauśāmbi.'[1] It is, therefore, permissible to think that Kauśāmbī existed in the time of Janaka, and hence of Nichakshu. There is thus no difficulty in the way of accepting the Purāṇic statement. According to the Purāṇas the change of capital was due to the inroad of the river Ganges. Another, and a more potent, cause was perhaps the devastation of the Kuru country by *Maṭachī*. It is also possible that the attitude of the Ābhipratāriṇa branch of the royal family towards sacrificial ritual had something to do with the exodus. From this time the Kurus in the homeland appear to have gradually lost their political importance. They sank to the level of a second-rate power. But the memory of the majesty and power of the Bharata dynasty survived till the time of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[2]

Pañchāla comprised the Bareilly, Budaun, Furrukhabad and the adjoining districts of Rohilkhand and the Central Doab in the modern Uttar Pradesh. It appears to have been bounded on the east by the Gumti and on the south by the Chambal. On the west lay the Yakṛillomas and the Śūrasenas of Mathurā. Belts of dense forests separated it from the Ganges and the realm of the Kurus on the north-west. Northward it approached the jungles that cover the region near the source of the Ganges.[3] There is no clear trace in the Vedic literature of the Epic and *Jātaka* division of the Pañchālas into northern (*Uttara*) and southern (*Dakshiṇa*). But it knew an eastern division because the *Saṁhit-opanishad Brāhmaṇa* makes

[1] Kauśāmbeya may no doubt also mean "a descendant of Kuśāmba" Even then the city can hardly be dissociated from the eponymous hero of the family. *Cf. Kramadīśvara*, p. 794—*Kuśāmbena nirvṛittā Kauśāmbī-nagarī*

[2] XIII. 5. 4 11-14; 21-23.

Mahadadya Bharatānāṁ na pūrve nāpare janāḥ
divyam martya iva pakshābhyāṁ nodāpuḥ saptamānavā (iti).

[3] *Ṛig-Veda*, V. 61. 17-19; Mbh. I. 138. 74; 150f; 166; IV. 5. 4; IX. 41

mention of the *Prāchya* (eastern) Pañchālas.[1] The existence of the other two may, however, be hinted at in the expression *tryanīka*, "threefold", occurring in the Vedic texts.[2] One of the ancient capitals of Pañchāla was Kāmpilya which has been identified with Kampil on the old Ganges between Budaun and Furrukhabad.[3] Another Pañchāla town Parivakrā or Parichakrā is mentioned in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[4] It is identified by Weber with Ekachakrā of the *Mahābhārata*.[5]

The Pañchālas, as their name indicates, probably consisted of five clans—the Krivis, the Turvaśas, the Keśins, the Sṛiñjayas and the Somakas.[6] Each of these clans is known to be associated with one or more princes mentioned in the Vedic texts—the Krivis with Kravya Pañchāla, the Turvaśas or Taurvaśas with Sona Sātrāsaha, the Keśins with Keśin Dālbhya, the Sṛiñjayas with Daivavāta, Prastoka, Vītahavya, Suplan or Sahadeva Sārñjaya and Dush-tarītu, and the Somakas with Somaka Sāhadevya. Of the kings only the first three are definitely associated with Pañchāla.

The **Krivis** appear in a *Ṛigvedic* hymn which also mentions the Sindhu (Indus) and the Asiknī (Chenāb). But their actual habitation is nowhere clearly indicated. They are identified with the Pañchālas in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[7] and connected with Parivakrā.

A *gāthā* of the same work[8] says, "When Sātrāsāha (King

[1] *Ved. Ind.*, I. 469. *Cf.* also Patañjali (Kielhorn's ed., Vol. I, p. 12) and Ptolemy's Prasiake (VII. 1. 53) which included the towns of Adisdara (? Ahi chhatra) and Kanagora (? Kanauj).

[2] *Vedic Index*, I. 187.

[3] *Vedic Index*, I. 149; Cunn. in JASB, 1865, 178; *AGI*, 1924. 413.

[4] XIII. 5. 4. 7.

[5] *Ved. Ind.*, I. 494.

[6] According to the *Purāṇas* (*Brahma P.* XIII. 94 f. *Cf. Matsya*, 50. 3) 'Mudgala', 'Sṛiñjaya', 'Bṛihadishu', 'Yavīnara' and 'Kṛimilāśva' were the constituent elements of the Pañchāla *Janapada*.

[7] xiii, 5, 4, 7; *Krivaya iti ha vai purā Pañchālān āchakshate*. *Vedic Index*, I. 198, According to Kasten Ronnow, *Acta Orientalia*, XVI, iii, 1937, p. 165 Krivis were named after a dragon-demon who was their tribal divinity.

[8] Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 404; *Śat. Br.* XIII. 5. 4. 16. H. K. Deb (*Vedic India and Mediterranean men*, Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig) suggests

of the Pañchālas) makes the *Aśvamedha* offering, the **Taurvaśas** arise, six thousand and six (*sic*) and thirty clad in mail."

Sātrāsahe yajamāne' śvamedhena Taurvaśāḥ
udīrate trayastriṁśāḥ shaṭsahasrāṇi varmiṇām.

This points to a very close connexion between the Pañchālas and the Taurvaśas. The fusion of the two folks does not seem to be improbable in view of the Purāṇic statement that, after Marutta, the line of Turvaśu (Turvaśa, Taurvaśa) was merged into the Paurava line[1] of which the Pañchālas are represented as an offshoot. The line of rulers to which Śona belonged seems to be connected in later times with Ahichchhatra (in the Bareilly District).[2]

The **Keśins**[3] who are connected with the Pañchālas in Vedic literature probably dwelt on the Gumti. The **Sriñjayas**[4] are associated with the Pañchālas in post-Vedic tradition. In the *Mahābhārata*,[5] Uttamaujas is called a Pāñchālya as well as a Sṛiñjaya. The clan probably lived on the Jumna in epic times.[6] As to the **Somakas**, their connection with the Pañchālas is known throughout the great epic.[7] They occupied Kāmpilya and its neighbourhood.

The royal family of the Pañchālas is represented in

the identification of the Turvaśas with the Teresh, or Tursha, one of the allied peoples who fought against Merneptah, or Meneptah, Pharaoh of Egypt (c. 1234-25 B.C.). Breasted, however, identifies the Teresh with the Tyrsenians or Etruscans (A *History of Egypt*, p. 467).

[1] *A. I. H. T.*, p. 108. *Turvasoḥ Pauravaṁ vaṁśaṁ praviveśa purā kila* (*Vāyu*. 99, 4).

[2] *Camb. Hist*, *Ind. I.* p 525.

[3] *Ved. Ind.*, I. 186-187. The name Keśin Dālbhya suggests a close connexion between the Keśins and the Dālbhyas whom the *Ṛig-Veda* (V. 61. 17 19) places on the Gomatī. From Mbh. IX. 41. 1-3 it is clear that this Gomatī connected with the Dālbhya family or clan, could not have been far away from Naimisha and the country of the Pañchālas. It must, therefore, be identified with the Gumti which flows past Nimsār near Sītāpur.

[4] Pargiter, *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, p. 353; Mbh., I. 138. 37; V. 48. 41. *Brahmapurāṇa*, XIII, 94 f.

[5] Mbh. VIII. 11, 31; 75. 9.

[6] Mbh. iii. 90. 7. with commentary.

[7] *Cf. Mbh.*, I. 185. 31; 193. 1; II. 77. 10: *Dhṛishṭa-dyumnaḥ Somakānāṁ pravarhaḥ, Saumakir Yajñasena iti.*

bardic tradition as an offshoot of the Bharata dynasty.[1] Divodāsa, Sudās (a) and Drupada are included among the kings of this line. Divodāsa and Sudās also figure in the *Ṛig-Veda* where they are closely connected with the Bharatas.[2] But they are not mentioned as Pañchāla kings. In the *Mahābhārata* Drupada is also called Yajñasena and one of his sons is named Śikhaṇḍin.[3] A Śikhaṇḍin Yājñasena is mentioned in the *Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa*,[4] but it is not clear whether we are to regard him as a prince, or as a priest of Keśin Dālbhya, King of the Pañchālas.

The external history of the Pañchālas is mainly that of wars and alliances with the Kurus. The *Mahābhārata* preserves traditions of conflict between these two great peoples. We are told by the epic that Uttara-Pañchāla was wrested from the Pañchālas by the Kurus and given away to their preceptor.[5] Curiously enough, the *Somanassa Jātaka*[6] places Uttara-Pañchāla-nagara in Kuru raṭṭha. The relations between the two peoples (Kurus and Pañchālas) were sometimes friendly and they were connected by matrimonial alliances. Keśin Dālbhya or Dārbhya, king of the Pañchālas, was sister's son to Uchchaiḥśravas, king of the Kurus.[7] In the epic a Pañchāla princess is married to the Pāṇḍavas who are represented as scions of the Kuru royal family.

Of the famous kings of the Pañchālas mentioned in the Vedic literature Pravahaṇa Jaivali is known definitely to have been Janaka's contemporary. This prince appears in the *Upanishads* as engaged in philosophical discussions with Āruṇi, Śvetaketu, Śilaka Śālāvatya, and Chaikitāyana

[1] Mbh., *Ādi.*, 94. 33; *Matsya*, 50. 1.16; *Vāyu*, 99. 194-210.
[2] *Ved. Ind.*, I, p. 363; II., pp. 59. 454.
[3] Mbh., *Ādi.*, 166. 24; *Bhīshma*, 190, *et seq.*
[4] VII. 4.
[5] Mbh. i. 166.
[6] No. 505. The union of Kuru-Pañchālas is hinted at in *Jaim. Up. Br.* III. 7. 6.
[7] *Ved. Ind.*, I. 84, 187, 468. Uchchaiḥśravas occurs as the name of a Kuru prince in the dynastic list of the *Mahābhārata*, I. 94. 53.

Dālbhya.[1] The first two teachers are known to have met the Vedic Janaka.

The kingdom of **Kāsi** was 300 leagues in extent.[2] It had its capital at Vārāṇasī (Benares) also called Ketumatī, Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahma-vaddhana, Pupphavatī, Ramma, and Molinī.[3] The walls of the city were twelve leagues round by themselves.[4]

The Kāśis, *i.e.*, the people of Kāśi or Kāsi, first appear in the *Paippalāda recension* of the *Atharva-Veda*.[5] They were closely connected with the Kosalas and the Videhas. Jala Jātūkarṇya is mentioned in the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*[6] as having obtained the position of *Purohita* or priest of the three peoples of Kāsi, Videha and Kosala in the lifetime of Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Janaka. Curiously enough, a king named Janaka is mentioned in the *Sattubhasta Jātaka*[7] as reigning in Benares. This prince cannot be the Janaka of the *Upanishads*, for we learn from those works that, in the time of the famous Janaka, Ajātaśatru was on the throne of Kāsi.

Very little is known regarding the ancestors of Ajātaśatru. His name does not occur in the Purāṇic lists of Kāsi sovereigns,[8] nor does the name of Dhṛitarāshṭra, king of Kāsi, who was defeated by Śatānīka Sātrājita with the result that the Kāśis down to the time of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* gave up the kindling of the sacred fire. A clue to the lineage of Dhṛitarāshṭra is afforded by the *Mahāgovinda-Suttanta*[9] which represents "Dhataraṭṭha," King of Kāsi, as a Bharata prince. The *Purāṇas* repre-

[1] *Bṛihad. Up.*, VI, 2; *Chh. Up.*, I. 8. 1; V. 3. 1.

[2] A stock phrase, *Dhajavihetha Jātaka*, No. 391.

[3] *Dialogues*, Part III, p. 73. *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, pp. 50-51. The name Vārāṇasī is derived from two little rivers between which the city was situated—*Varaṇāyāstathā ch Asyā madhye Vārāṇasī purī* (*Pādma*, *Svarga khaṇḍa*, xvii. 50).

[4] *Taṇḍulanāli Jātaka*, No. 5.

[5] *Ved Ind.*, II, 116 n.

[6] XVI. 29. 5.

[7] No. 402.

[8] *Vāyu*, 99. 21-74; *Vishṇu*, IV, 8. 2-9.

[9] *Rhys Davids*, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part II, p. 270.

sent the Kāsi family as a branch of the house of Purūravas, the traditional ancestor of the Bharatas. Of the kings mentioned in the chronicles the names of two only (Divodāsa and his son or descendant Daivadāsi Pratardana) can be traced in the Vedic literature. But the later Vedic texts connect them with the Naimishīyas and not with Kāsi.[1]

The *Jātakas* often refer to the failure of heirs at Benares (*aputtakaṁ rājakulam*), or the deposition of princes in favour of more competent rulers taken from other families. It is clear that tradition does not regard the Kāsi monarchs as belonging to one and the same dynasty. Some of the kings hailed from Magadha.[2] Several others were probably of Videhan origin. Many of the princes belonging to these groups had the cognomen, 'Brahmadatta.' That Brahmadatta was not the name of one individual ruler, has been suggested by Mr. Hāritkṛishṇa Dev.[3] The *Matsya* and *Vāyu Purāṇas* refer to a group of one hundred (*i.e. many*) Brahmadattas:

Śataṁ vai Brahmadattānāṁ
vīrāṇāṁ Kuravaḥ śatam.[4]

The "hundred" Brahmadattas are also mentioned in the *Mahābhārata.*[5] In the *Dummedha Jātaka*[6] the name is borne both by the reigning king and his son (*Kumāra*).[7] In the *Gaṅgamāla Jātaka*[8] king Udaya of Benares is addressed by a *Pachcheka Buddha* as "Brahmadatta" which is distinctly stated to be a *kulanāma* or family designation.

The Brahmadattas were not, however, all of the same extraction. The king-elect of the *Darīmuka Jātaka* was originally a Magadhan prince. Some of the other Brahma-

[1] *Kaush. Br.*, xxvi. 5.

[2] Cf. *Jātakas*, 378, 401, 529.

[3] The suggestion has been accepted by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, p. 56

[4] *Matsya*, Ch. 273, 71; *Vāyu*, Ch. 99, 454.

[5] II. 8. 23.

[6] No. 50; Vol. I. p. 126.

[7] *Cf.* also the *Susīma Jātaka* (411), the *Kumma Sapinda Jātaka* (415), the *Aṭṭhāna Jātaka* (425), the *Lomasa Kassapa Jātaka* (433), etc.

[8] 421.

dattas were of Videhan lineage. The *Mātiposaka Jātaka*,[1] for instance, referring to a Brahmadatta of Kāsi, has the following line:

mutto'mhi Kāsirājena Vedehena yasassinā ti.

In the *Sambula Jātaka*[2] prince Sotthisena, son of Brahmadatta, king of Kāsi, is called Vedehaputta:

Yo putta Kāsirājassa Sotthiseno ti tam vidū
tassāham Sambulā bhariyā, evaṁ jānāhi dānava,
Vedehaputto bhaddan te vane vasati āturo.

Ajātaśatru, Janaka's contemporary on the throne of Kāsi, may have been a Brahmadatta though his exact lineage is not known. The Upanishadic evidence shows that he was a contemporary of Uddālaka. The *Uddālaka Jātaka* tells us that the reigning king of Benares in the time of Uddālaka was Brahmadatta.

Ajātaśatru appears in the *Upanishads* as engaged in philosophical discussions with Gārgya Bālāki In the *Kaushītaki Upanishad* he is represented as being jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] mentions a person named Bhadrasena Ajātaśatrava who is said to have been bewitched by Uddālaka Āruṇi. Macdonell and Keith call him a king of Kāsi. He may have been the son and successor of Ajātaśatru.[4]

The kingdom of **Kosala**[5] corresponds roughly to the modern Oudh It seems to have extended northward to the foot of the Nepāl hills. In the east it was separated from Videha by the river Sadānīrā, which was for a time the limit of the Aryan world in that direction. Beyond it was an extensive marshy region, not frequented by Brāhmaṇas which, after Māthava Videgha's occupation, developed into the flourishing kingdom of Videha. The story of Māthava makes it clear that the Kosalas fell later than the peoples dwelling on the banks of the Sarasvatī

[1] No. 455.
[2] No. 519.
[3] V. 5. 5. 14.
[4] S. B. E., XLI. p. 141.
[5] The form Kośala is met with in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* (*Vedic Index* I. 195) and later literature.

but earlier than the Videhas under the influence of Brāhmaṇical civilization. In the south Kosala was bounded by the river Sarpikā or Syandikā[1] and on the west probably by the Gumti which flowed past the famous Naimisha forest and apparently formed the boundary between the Kosalas and sundry peoples including the Pañchālas.[2] In the epic Kosalas proper are distinguished from the Uttara-Kosalas, the Kosalas near the Venvā (Waingaṅgā) and the Prāk-Kosalas. The last two peoples were clearly in South India.[3] The Pūrva-Kosalas, apparently not identical with the Prāk-Kosalas of the Deccan, dwelt between the river Sarayū and Mithilā.[4]

The Vedic texts do not mention any city in Kosala. But if the *Rāmāyaṇa* is to be believed the capital of Kosala (Kosalapura) in the time of the Janakas was Ayodhyā. It stood on the banks of the Sarayū and covered twelve *yojanas*.[5] The *Ṛig-Veda* mentions the river Sarayū and refers to an Aryan settlement on its banks.[6] One of the Ārya settlers bears the name of Chitraratha which occurs also in the *Rāmāyaṇa*,[7] as the appellation of a contemporary of Daśaratha. A prince styled Daśaratha is eulogised in a Ṛigvedic hymn,[8] but there is nothing to identify him with the Ikshvāku king of that name who appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the Kosalan contemporary of Sīradhvaja Janaka. Daśaratha's eldest son, according to the epic, was Rāma who married Sītā, daughter of Janaka. The *Ṛig-Veda*[9] mentions an *Asura*

[1] Rām. II 49 11-12; 50. 1, *Cf.* Sundarikā, *Kindred Sayings* I 209

[2] Rām. II. 68. 13; 71. 16-18; VII. 104. 15. (Kosalan king sacrificing in the Naimisha forest on the Gumti); cf. Mbh VII. [illegible] 2, IX. 41. 3 (Pañchālas apparently not far from Naimisha) In *Rig V* [illegible] 17-19 the Dālbhyas a Pañchāla people, are placed on the Gumti

[3] Mbh II. 30. 2-3; 31. 12-13.

[4] Mbh. II. 20. 28.

[5] *Rām.* I. 55. 7. It is in the Fyzabad District of Oudh. For the name Kosalapura see *Rām.* II 18. 38

[6] IV. 30. 18.

[7] II. 32. 17.

[8] I. 126. 4.

[9] X. 93. 14.

(powerful being) named Rāma but does not connect him with Kosala. The *Daśaratha Jātaka* makes Daśaratha and Rāma kings of Vārāṇasī and disavows Sītā's connection with Janaka.

Kosala was probably the fatherland of Janaka's *hotṛi* priest, Aśvala, who was very probably an ancestor of Āśvalāyana Kausalya[1] mentioned in the *Praśna Upanishad* as a disciple of Pippalāda and a contemporary of Sukeśā Bhāradvāja and of Hiraṇyanābha, a Kosalan prince. The details of Kosalan history will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Section III. The Later Vaidehas of Mithila: Nimi and Karāla

The *Purāṇas* give long lists of the successors of Sīradhvaja Janaka[2] whom Bhavabhūti seems to identify with the contemporary of Yājñavalkya.[3] With one or two exceptions none of the kings in these lists can be satisfactorily identified with the Videhan monarchs mentioned in the Vedic, Buddhist and Jaina literature. It is, therefore, difficult to say how far the lists are reliable. The identification of any of the kings named in the bardic chronicles with the Vedic Janaka is the most knotty of all problems. We have already noted the arguments that can be urged in support of the view of Bhavabhūti. The mere fact that Sīradhvaja is placed high in the Purāṇic lists does not necessarily prove that he actually flourished long before the extinction of the dynasty. It should be remembered in this connection that Pradyota who was in reality a contemporary of Bimbisāra, king of Magadha, is placed by the Purāṇic chroniclers or scribes some nine

[1] *Aśvalasyāpatyam Āśvalāyanaḥ* (Śaṁkara's commentary on *Praśna Upanishad*, 1. 1).

[2] *Vāyu*, 89. 18-23; *Vishṇu*, IV. 5. 12-13; 4th edition of this work. pp. 67 ff.

[3] *Mahāvīra-charita*, I, verse 14; II, verse 43; *Uttara-Rāma-Charita*, IV. verse 9.

generations before that ruler, and Siddhārtha of the Ikshvāku list, a contemporary of Prasenajit of Kosala, is represented as the grandfather of the latter. The evidence of the *Vishṇu Purāṇ*[1] suggests that there were at times several collateral lines of Janakas who ruled contemporaneously. The problem of Sīradhvaja must, therefore, be regarded as *sub judice*. In view of the uncertainty about the identification of this king and his proper place in the dynastic list, it is not easy to determine which of the Videhan kings mentioned in the *Purāṇic* chronicles actually came *after* the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. The evidence of the *Jātakas*, however, suggests that a king named Nimi, at any rate, ruled after the great Janaka, as he is called the penultimate sovereign of the dynasty. Pargiter[2] places all the kings of the Purāṇic lists down to Bahulāśva *before* the Bhārata war, and apparently identifies his son Kṛiti with Kṛitakshaṇa of the *Mahābhārata*[3] a contemporary of Yudhishṭhira. But as there were "Janakas," even *after* Yudhishṭhira, and as two *Purāṇas* conclude with the remark that with Kṛiti *ends* the race of the Janakas,"[4] the identification of Kṛiti, the *last* of the race, with Kṛitakshaṇa does not seem to be plausible. It is more reasonable to identify Kṛiti of the *Purāṇas* with Karāla Janaka who, as we shall see below, brought the line of Vaideha kings to an end. The only objection to this view is that Karāla is represented as the son of Nimi, whereas Kṛiti was the son of Bahulāśva. But the cognomen Nimi may have been borne by several kings and Bahulāśva may have been one of them. An alternative theory would be to represent Kṛiti and Karāla as the last members of two collateral lines of Janakas.

The Vedic texts mention besides Māthava and Janaka two other Vaideha kings, namely, Namī Sāpya and Para

[1] VI. 6. 7 ff. Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 72. 18.
[2] AIHT, p. 149.
[3] II. 4. 27.
[4] AIHT, pp. 96, 330.

Āhlāra. Macdonell and Keith identify the latter with Para Āṭṇāra, king of Kosala, about whom we shall speak in a subsequent chapter. Namī Sāpya is mentioned in the *Pañchaviṁśa* or *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa*[1] as a famous sacrificer. His identification with king Namī of the *Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra*[2] Nemi of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, and Nimi of the *Makhādeva Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*, and the *Kumbhakāra*[3] and *Nimi Jātakas*[4] is more or less problematical. In the last-mentioned work it is stated that Nimi was the penultimate sovereign of the Maithila family. According to the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* and the *Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra* he was a contemporary of Dummukha (Dvimukha), king of Pañchāla, Naggaji (Naggati) of Gandhāra and of Karaṇḍu (Karakaṇḍu) of Kaliṅga. This synchronism accords with Vedic evidence. Durmukha, the Pañchāla king, had a priest named Bṛihaduktha[5] who was the son of Vāmadeva[6] Vāmadeva was a contemporary of Somaka, the son of Sahadeva[7]. Somaka had close spiritual relationship with Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra[8]. From this it seems very probable that Durmukha was a contemporary of Nagnajit. This is exactly what we find in the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* and the *Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra*.

The *Nimi Jātaka* says that Nimi was "born to round off" the royal family "like the hoop of a chariot wheel." Addressing his predecessor the soothsayers said, "Great king, this prince is born to round off your family. This your family of hermits will go no further."

Nimi's son Kalāra Janaka[9] is said to have actually brought his line to an end. This king is apparently iden-

1 XXV. 10, 17-18.
2 S.B.E., XLV. 87.
3 No. 408.
4 No. 541.
5 *Vedic Index*, I. 370.
6 *Ibid.*, II. 71.
7 *Ṛig-Veda*, IV. 15, 7-10 with *Anukramoṇī*.
8 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII 34.
9 *Makhādeva Sutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya*. II. 82; *Nimi Jātaka*.

tical with Karāla Janaka of the *Mahābhārata*.[1] In the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya it is stated that "Bhoja, known by the name of Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations; so also Karāla, the Vaideha."[2] Karāla, the Vaideha, who perished along with his kingdom and relations, must be identified with Kalāra (Karāla) who, according to the *Nimi Jātaka*, brought the line of Videhan kings to an end. The downfall of the Vaidehas reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian Confederacy.

There is reason to believe that the Kāsi people had a share in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy Already in the time of the great Janaka, Ajātaśatru, king of Kāsi, could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan king's fame. The passage "*yathā Kāśyo vā Vaideho vā Ugraputra ujjyam dhanur adhijyaṁ kritvā dvau vāṇavantau sapatnātivyādhinau haste kritv-opatishṭhed*"[3] probably refers to frequent struggles between the heroes of Kāsi and Videha. The *Mahābhārata*[4] refers to the old story (*itihāsaṁ purātanam*) of a great battle between Pratardana, king of Kāsi according to the Rāmāyaṇa,[5] and Janaka, King of Mithilā. It is stated in the Pāli commentary *Param-attha jotikā*[6] that the Lichchhavis who succeeded Janaka's dynasty as the strongest political power in North Bihar, and formed the most important element of the

[1] XII. 302. 7.

[2] The evidence of the *Arthaśāstra* is confirmed by that of the *Buddha-charita* of Aśvaghosha (IV 80). "And so Karāla Janaka, when he carried off the Brāhmaṇa's daughter, incurred loss of caste thereby, but he would not give up his love."

[3] *Brihad Upanishad*, III. 8. 2 "As the Ugra's son from Kāsi or from Videha strings the slackened bow and arises with two foe-piercing arrows in his hand" (Winternitz, *Ind. Lit.* translation I. 229 with slight emendations).

[4] XII. 99. 1-2

[5] VII. 48 15.

[6] Vol. I, pp. 158-165.

already in the age of the later Vaidehas, Nimi and Karāla, the Aryans had crossed the Vindhyas and established several kingdoms in the territory that stretched from the Revā or the Narmadā to the Godāvarī. One of these realms was **Vidarbha.** It comprised modern Berar, the Varadātaṭa of the *Āīn-i-Ākbarī*, and a considerable portion of the Central Provinces lying between the Wardhā (Varadā) and the Waingaṅgā. In the north it reached the Payoshṇī, a tributary of the Tāptī[1]. Vidarbha was certainly a famous kingdom in the time of Nimi. We have already seen that the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* and the *Uttar-ādhyayana* make him a contemporary of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, who is known from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[2] to have flourished about the same time as Bhīma, king of Vidarbha:

"*Etamu haiva prochatuḥ Parvata-Nāradau Somakāya Sāhadevyāya Sahadevāya Sārñjayāya Babhrave Daivāvṛidhāya Bhīmāya Vaidarbhāya Nagnajite Gāndhārāya.*"

"This Parvata and Nārada proclaimed to Somaka Sāhadevya, Sahadeva Sārñjaya, Babhru Daivāvṛidha, Bhīma Vaidarbha (*i.e.* of Vidarbha) and Nagnajit of Gandhāra."

Vidarbha, therefore, existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi. From the Purāṇic account of the Yadu family it appears that the eponymous hero of the Vidarbhas, was of Yadu lineage.[3] The country is mentioned in the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*.[4] It was famous for its *Māchalas*, perhaps a species of dog, which killed tigers[5]—"*Vidarbheṣu mācalās sārameyā apīha śārdūlān mārayanti.*" The *Praśna Upanishad*[6] mentions a sage of Vidarbha named Bhārgava as a contemporary of Āśvalāyana. Another sage called Vidarbhī Kauṇḍinya is mentioned in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*.[7] The name Kauṇḍinya is appar-

[1] Mbh. III. 61. 22-23; 120. 31.
[2] VII. 34.
[3] *Matsya Purāṇa*, 44. 36; *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 95, 35-36.
[4] II, 440: *Ved. Ind.*, II. 297.
[5] *JAOS*, 19, 100.
[6] I. 1; II. 1.
[7] *Vedic Index*, II. 297.

To face page 76

ently derived from the city of Kuṇḍina, the capital of Vidarbha,[1] represented by the modern Kauṇḍinya-pura on the banks of Wardhā in the Chāṇḍur tāluk of Amraoti.[2] The association of Vidarbha with Kuṇḍina clearly suggests that Vidarbha of the Vedic texts lay in the Deccan, and not in some hitherto unknown region outside its boundaries as contended by a well-known writer.[3]

If the evidence of the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* has any value, then Nimi, king of Videha, mentioned in the work, Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra, and Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, must be considered to have been contemporaries of Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga. It follows from this that the kingdom of **Kaliṅga** too, was in existence in the time of Nimi and his contemporaries of the *Brāhmaṇa* period. The evidence of the *Jātaka* is confirmed by that of the *Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra*. The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta*,[4] makes Sattabhu, king of Kaliṅga, a contemporary of Reṇu, king of Mithilā and of Dhataraṭṭha, or Dhṛitarāshṭra, king of Kāsi, mentioned in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[5] There can thus be no doubt that Kaliṅga existed as an independent kingdom in the time of which the Brāhmaṇas speak. It is mentioned both by Pāṇini[6] and Baudhāyana.[7] The latter regards it as an impure country but evidently not unfrequented by Aryans.[8] According to epic tradition it comprised the whole coast from the river Vaitaraṇī[9]

[1] Mbh., III. 73. 1-2; V. 157. 14; *Harivaṁśa*, *Vishṇuparva*, 59-60.

[2] *Gaz.*, *Amraoti*, Vol. A. p. 406.

[3] *Indian Culture*, July, 1936, p. 12. Curiously enough, the same writer, who characterises the provisional acceptance of the uncontradicted testimony of the *Purāṇas* and lexicons in locating tribes mentioned in Vedic literature as unhistorical, has no hesitation in identifying the Satvats of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* with the Yādavas and in placing them in the Mathurā region and adjoining districts (*ibid.*, 15). He has not referred to any *Vedic* text which supports his conjecture regarding the identity of the Satvats and their association with the particular city named by him.

[4] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II 270.

[5] XIII. 5. 4. 22.

[6] IV. 1. 170.

[7] I. 1. 30-31.

[8] There was a considerable Brāhmaṇa population in Kaliṅga in the days of Aśoka (*cf.* Edict XIII).

[9] Mbh., III. 114. 4.

in Orissa to the borders of the Andhra territory. The southern boundary of the *Janapada* was not well-defined. It reached Yellamanchili and Chipurupalle in the Vizagapatam district and at times even Pishṭapura or Pithapuram, north-east of the Godāvarī, but not the river itself which flowed through the Andhra country. Pargiter says that Kaliṅga as a settled kingdom appears to have consisted properly of the plain between the Eastern Ghats (*Mahendra* range) and the sea. But its kings seem to have exercised suzerainty over the Jungle tribes which inhabited the hills far inland, for the Amarakaṇṭaka range, in which the Narmadā rises, is said to be in the western part of Kaliṅga. That large tracts of the country were covered with forests appears from references to *Kaliṅgāraṇya* in Pāli texts. The windows of the capital city in the days of Kālidāsa looked out on the sea, and the deep roar of the waves drowned the sound of trumpets.[1] In the days of Yuan Chwang Kaliṅga occupied a much smaller area It is distinguished from Wu-t'u (Orissa) and Kung-yu-t'o (Koṅgoda in the Ganjam district) in the north, and An-to-lo (Andhra or Veṅgī) in the south, and seems to have embraced parts of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts. We learn from the Jātakas that an ancient capital of Kaliṅga was Dantapura-nagara.[2] The *Mahābhārata* mentions Rājapura as the metropolis.[3] The *Mahāvastu*[4] refers to another city named Siṁhapura.

[1] Ind. Ant., 1923, 67; *Ep. Ind.* XII. 2; *JASB*, 1897, 98 ff; *Kūrma*, p. II. 39. 9; *Pādma, Svarga-Khaṇḍa*, VI. 22; *Vāyu*, 77, 4-13; Malalasekera, DPPN. 584; *Raghuvaṁśa*, vi. 56

[2] *Cf. Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 361. *Danta-pura-vāsakāt*; Dantakūra, Mbh. V. 48. 76. Dandagula (Pliny. M'Cridle, *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, p. 144). The name of the city probably survives in that of the fort of Dantavaktra near Chicacole in the Gañjām district. Many other Kaliṅga capitals stood in the same district, *e.g.*, Siṁhapura (Singupuram) near Chicacole, Dubreuil, *A.H.D.*, p. 94, Kaliṅga-nagara (Mukhaliṅgam on the Vaṁśadharā, *Ep. Ind.*, IV. 187; Kaliṅga-pātam is preferred in *Ind. Ant.*, 1887, 132; JBORS, 1929, pp. 623 f But the arguments adduced are not all plausible).

[3] XII. 4. 3.

[4] Senart's edition, p. 432.

The Jaina writers mention a fourth town called Kaṁchaṇapura.[1]

The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* refers to another southern realm, namely, **Assaka** or Aśmaka on the God(h)āvarī,[2] which existed in the time of the monarchs Reṇu and Dhata-raṭṭha (Dhṛita-rāshṭra). It was ruled by king Brahmadatta who held his Court at Potana.

The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* alludes[3] to princes of the South who are called **Bhojas** and whose subjects are called *Satvats: "dakshiṇasyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ rājāno Bhaujyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Bhoj-etye-nān-abhishiktān-āchakshata—"* "in the southern region whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for *Bhaujya;* 'O Bhoja' they style them when consecrated (in accordance with the action of the deities)." In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[4] the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats, and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an *Aśvamedha* or horse-sacrifice are referred to. These Satvats must have been living near Bharata's realm, *i.e.*, near the Ganges and the Yamunā.[5] But in the time of

[1] *Ind Ant.*, 1891, p. 375 The *Bhūmikhaṇḍa* of the *Padmapurāṇa* (47. 9) mentions Śrīpura as a city in Kalinga.

[2] *Sutta Nipāta*, 977. SBE, X, pt. ii, 184 *Cf.* Asmagi (*Bomb Gaz.* I. i. p. 532, *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, 145) of classical writers. *Aśmaka* is also mentioned by Pāṇini, IV. 1. 173. As the name signifies "the stony region", it can hardly refer to Aśvaka, the land of the Assakenoi in the north-west which the *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, connects with the Sanskrit *aśva*, and Iranian *aspa*, horse. The Commentator Bhaṭṭasvāmin identifies Aśmaka with Mahārāshṭra The capital was Potali or Potana (*Chullakāliṅga Jātaka* No. 301; *Assaka J.* (207); D. 2. 235; *Pariśishṭa parvan*, I. 92. *nagare Potanābhidhe. Bomb. Gaz.* I. 1. 535; Law, *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*, 74; Mbh. 1. 177. 47; *cf.* Pāḍana of Lüders' List, 616, and N. G. Majumder's List, 658 (*Monuments*, p. 365—*Visākhasa Pādā(ṁ)yasa*). Dr. Sukṭhankar points out that the Paudanya of the printed editions of the *Mahābhārata* is a late corruption. The older Mss. give the name as Potana or Podana. This name reminds one of Bodhan in the Nizam's dominions which lies to the south of the confluence of the Manjirā and the Godāvarī. The city of Podana is said to have been founded by a prince of the Ikshvāku family, who is the eponymous hero of the land of Aśmaka. The neighbouring people of Mūlaka also claimed Ikshvāku descent (*Vāyu*, 88. 177-178).

[3] VIII. 14.

[4] XIII. 5. 4. 21.

[5] *Ibid.*, XIII. 5. 4. 11.

the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* they probably moved farther to the south. They are placed in the southern region (*dakshiṇā diś*) beyond the "fixed middle region"—the land of the Kurus, Pañchālas and some neighbouring tribes. The Pañchāla realm, according to epic testimony, extended as far south as the Chambal.[1] The Satvat people of the "southern region" mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, therefore, in all probability, lived beyond that river. Their kings were called Bhojas. This account of the Satvats and the Bhojas, deduced from the Brāhmaṇic statements, accords with Purāṇic evidence. It is stated in the *Purāṇas* that the Sātvat(a)s and the Bhojas were offshoots of the Yadu family which dwelt at Mathurā on the banks of the Yamunā.[2] We are further told by the same authorities that they were the kindreds of the southern realm of Vidarbha.[3] We have evidence of a closer connection between the Bhojas and the last-mentioned territory. A place called Bhojakaṭa, is included within Vidarbha both by the *Mahābhārata*[4] and the *Harivaṁśa*.[5] The Chammak grant of the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II makes it clear that the Bhojakaṭa territory included the Ilichpur district in Berar, a part of ancient Vidarbha.[6] As pointed out by Dr. Smith, the name of Bhojakaṭa, 'castle of the Bhojas,' implies that the province was named after a stronghold formerly held by the Bhojas, an ancient ruling race mentioned in the edicts of Aśoka.[7] Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvaṁśa*[8] calls the king of Vidarbha a Bhoja.[9]

But Vidarbha was not the only Bhoja state. The

[1] Mbh., I. 138. 74; *Dakshiṇāṁśchāpi Pāñchālān yāvach Charmaṇvatī nadī.*

[2] *Matsya* 43. 48; 44. 46-48; *Vayu*, 94. 52; 95. 18; 96. 1-2 *Vishṇu*, IV. 13. 1-6.

[3] *Mat.*, 44. 36; *Vāyu*, 95. 35-36.

[4] V. 157. 15-16. [5] *Vishṇu parva*, 60. 32.

[6] *JRAS.*, 1914. p. 329.

[7] In *Ind. Ant.*, 1923, 262-63, Bhojakaṭa is identified with Bhat-kuli in the Amraoti district.

[8] V. 39-40.

[9] *Cf.* also Mbh., V. 48. 74; 157. 17; *Harivaṁśa*, *Vishṇu parva*, 47. 5.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa refers to several Bhoja kings of the south. A line of Bhojas must have ruled **Daṇḍaka**. A passage in the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[1] runs thus:—

"*Dāṇḍakyo nāma Bhojaḥ kāmāt Brāhmaṇa-kanyām abhimanyamānas sabandhu-rāshṭro vinanāśa*"—a Bhoja known as Dāṇḍakya, or king of Daṇḍaka, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa girl, perished along with his relations and kingdom. We learn from the *Sarabhaṅga Jātaka*[2] that the kingdom of Daṇḍaki (Daṇḍaka) had its capital at Kumbhavatī. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa*[3] the name of the metropolis was Madhumanta, while the *Mahāvastu*[4] places it at Govardhana (Nāsik).

It is clear, from what has been stated above, that there were in the age of the later Vaidehas, and the treatises called Brāhmaṇas, many kingdoms in the south, both Aryan and non-Aryan, namely, the Bhoja kingdoms, one of which was Vidarbha, and another, probably, Daṇḍaka, as well as Aśmaka and Kaliṅga. With the exception of these organised states the whole of Trans-Vindhyan India was occupied by non-Aryan (*dasyu*) tribes such as the Andhras, Śavaras, Pulindas and probably also the Mūtibas.[5]

In the opinion of Dr. Smith the **Andhras** were a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. Mr. P. T. Śrīnivās Iyengar argues that the Andhras were originally a Vindhyan tribe and that the extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godāvarī and Kṛishṇā valleys.[6] Dr. Bhandarkar points out that the *Serivāṇij Jātaka* places Andhapura, *i.e.*, the *pura* or capital of the Andhras, on the river Telavāha which he

[1] Ed. 1919, p. 11.
[2] No. 522.
[3] VII. 92. 18.
[4] Senart's Edition, p. 363.
[5] *Ait. Br.*, VII. 18.
[6] *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, pp. 276-78.

identifies with the modern Tel or Telingiri.[1] But if 'Seri' or *Śrī rājya*[2] refers to the Gaṅga kingdom of Mysore, Telavāha may have been another name of the Tuṅga-bhadrā-Kṛishṇā, and Andhapura identical with Bezvāḍa or some neighbouring city.[3] The Mayidavolu plates of the early Pallava ruler Śivaskanda-varman prove that the Andhra country (*Andhrāpatha*) embraced the lower valley of the Krishṇā and had its centre at Dhaññakaḍa, *i.e.*, Bezvāḍa, or some neighbouring city on the south bank of the Kṛishnā.[4] Yuan Chwang applies the name An-to-lo (Andhra) to the district round Ping-ki-lo (Veṅgīpura) near Ellore. In later times the *Andhra-Khaṇḍa* extended from the Godāvarī to the borders of Kaliṅga (*ārabhya Gautamanadītaṭam ākaliṅgam*) and included Piṭhāpurī (Pithapuram).[5]

The **Śavaras** and the Pulindas are described in the *Matsya* and the *Vāyu Purāṇas* as *Dakshiṇā-patha-vāsinaḥ*, inhabitants of the Deccan, together with the Vaidarbhas and the Daṇḍakas:

Teshām pare janapadā Dakshiṇā-patha-vāsinaḥ

* * * *

Kārūshāścha saha-Ishīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śavarās tathā
Pulindā Vindhya-Pushikā (?) *Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha*[6].
Ābhīrāḥ saha cha-Ishīkāḥ Āṭavyāḥ Śavarāścha ye
Pulindā Vindhya-Mūlikā Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakaiḥ saha.[7]

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, p. 71 There is also a river called 'Ter' in South India. *Ep. Ind.*, XXII. 29

[2] *Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions*, 38. 'Seri' may also refer to Śrī Vijaya or Śrī Vishaya (Sumatra ?).

[3] The name Telavāha, oil-carrier, reminds one of the passages "*Vikhyāta-Kṛishṇā-verṇā (= Kṛishṇā)-taila-snehopalabdha-saralatva*' (*IA*, VIII. 17, *cf.* Ep. XII. 153)—"with a smoothness caused by sesame oil of the famous (river) Kṛishṇā."

[4] Hultzsch (Ep. Ind. VI. 85) identified the city with Amarāvatī. Burgess suggested Dharanikota which lies about 18 miles to the westward from Bezvāda, on the right bank of the Kṛishnā Fergusson, Sewell and Watters prefer Bezvāda itself (Yuan Chwang, II. 216). In the days of the great Chinese pilgrim *An-to-lo* (Andhra) had its capital at *Ping-ki-lo* or Veṅgīpura in the Kṛishṇā district.

[5] Watters: II. 209f *IA*, xx, 93; *Ep. Ind.*, IV. 357.

[6] *Matsya*, 114, 46-48.

[7] *Vāyu*, 45. 126.

CHAPTER III. MAHĀJANAPADAS AND KINGSHIP

SECTION I. THE SIXTEEN MAHĀJANAPADAS

The Vedic texts do not throw much light on the political condition of the period which elapsed from the fall of the Videhan monarchy, probably early in the sixth century B.C., to the rise of Kosala under Mahākosala, the father-in-law of Bimbisāra, about the middle of that century. But we learn from the Buddhist *Aṅguttara Nikāya* that during this period there were sixteen states of considerable extent and power known as the "*Solasa Mahājanapada.*"[1] These states were: —

1	Kāsi (Kāśi)	9.	Kuru
2	Kosala (Kośala)	10.	Pañchāla
3.	Aṅga	11.	Machchha (Matsya)
4.	Magadha	12.	Śūrasena
5.	Vajji (Vṛiji)	13.	Assaka (Aśmaka)
6	Malla	14.	Avanti
7.	Chetiya (Chedi)	15.	Gandhāra
8	Vaṁsa (Vatsa)	16.	Kamboja

These *Mahājanapadas* flourished together during a period posterior to Karāla-Janaka but anterior to Mahākosala, because one of them, Vajji, apparently rose to power after the fall of the Videhan monarchy, while another, namely, Kāsi, lost its independence before the time of Mahākosala and formed an integral part of the Kosalan empire in the latter half of the sixth century B.C.

The Jaina *Bhagavatī Sūtra*[2] gives a slightly different list of the sixteen *Mahājanapadas*:

1.	Aṅga	6.	Achchha
2.	Baṅga (Vaṅga)	7.	Vachchha (Vatsa)
3.	Magaha (Magadha)	8.	Kochchha (Kachchha ?)
4.	Malaya	10.	Lāḍha (Lāṭa or Rāḍha)
5.	Mālava (ka)	9.	Pāḍha (Pāṇḍya or Pauṇḍra)

[1] *PTSI.*, 213; IV, 252, 256, 260. The *Mahāvastu* (I. 34) gives a similar list, but omits Gandhāra and Kamboja, substituting in their place Śibi and Daśārṇa in the Punjab (or Rājputānā) and Central India respectively. A less complete list is found in the *Jana-vasabha-suttanta.*

[2] *Saya* xv *Uddessa I* (Hoernle, the *Uvāsagadasāo, II* Appendix); W. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie Der Inder*, 225

To face page 85

11. Bajji (Vajji)
12. Molī (Malla)
13. Kāsi (Kāśi)
14. Kosala
15. Avāha
16. Sambhuttara (Sumhottara ?)

It will be seen that Aṅga, Magadha, Vatsa, Vajji, Kāsi, and Kosala are common to both the lists. Mālava of the *Bhagavatī* is probably identical with Avanti of the *Aṅguttara*. Molī is probably a corruption of Malla. The other states mentioned in the *Bhagavatī* are new, and indicate a knowledge of the far east and the far south of India. The more extended horizon of the *Bhagavatī* clearly proves that its list is later than the one given in the Buddhist *Aṅguttara*.[1] We shall, therefore, accept the Buddhist list as a correct representation of the political condition of India after the fall of the House of Janaka.

Of the sixteen *Mahājanapadas* **Kāsi** was probably at first the most powerful. We have already seen that Kāsi probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy. Several *Jātakas* bear witness to the superiority of its capital Benares over the other cities, and the imperial ambition of its rulers. The *Guttila Jātaka*[2] says that the city of Benares is the chief city in all India. It extended over twelve leagues[3] whereas Mithilā and Indapatta were each only seven leagues in extent.[4] Several Kāsi monarchs are described as aspirants for the dignity of the chief king of all kings (*sabbarājunam aggarājā*), and lord of the whole of India (*sakala-Jambudīpa*).[5] The *Mahāvagga* also mentions the fact that Kāsi was in former

[1] Mr. E. J. Thomas suggests (*History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 6) that the Jaina author who makes no mention of the northern Kambojas and Gandhāras but includes several south Indian peoples in his list, "wrote in South India and compiled his list from countries that he knew." If the writer was really ignorant of the northern peoples his Mālavas could not have been in the Puñjāb and must be located in Central India In that case his account can hardly be assigned to a very early date.

[2] No. 243

[3] *Dvādasa-yojanikam sakala-Bārāṇasī-nagaram*"—*Sambhava Jātaka*, No. 515; *Sarabha-miga J.*, 483; *Bhūridatta J.*, 543.

[4] *Suruchi.*, *J.*, 489; *Vidhurapaṇḍita J.*, 545.

[5] *Bhaddasāla Jātaka*, 465; *Dhonasākha Jātaka*, 353.

times a great and prosperous realm, possessed of immense resources:

"Bhūtapubbaṁ bhikkhave Bārāṇasiyam Brahmadatto nāma Kāsirājā ahosi aḍḍho mahaddhano mahābhogo mahadbalo mahāvāhano mahāvijito paripuṇṇakosa-koṭṭhāgāro."[1]

The Jainas also afford testimony to the greatness of Kāsi, and represent Aśvasena, king of Benares, as the father of their *Tīrthaṅkara Pārśva* who is said to have died 250 years before Mahāvīra, *i.e.*, in or about 777 B.C.

Already in the *Brāhmaṇa* period a king of Kāsi, named Dhṛitarāshṭra, attempted to offer a horse-sacrifice, but was vanquished by Śatānīka Sātrājita with the result that the Kāśis down to the time of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, gave up the kindling of the sacred fire.[2] Some of the other Kāsi monarchs were more fortunate. Thus in the *Brahāchatta Jātaka*[3] a king of Benares is said to have gone against the king of Kosala with a large army. He entered the city of Sāvatthī and took the king prisoner. The *Kosāmbī Jātaka*,[4] the *Kunāla Jātaka*,[5] and the *Mahāvagga*[6] refer to the annexation of the kingdom of Kosala by the Brahmadattas of Kāsi.[7] The *Assaka Jātaka*[8] refers to the city of Potali, the capital of Assaka on the Godāvarī, as a city of the kingdom of Kāsi. Evidently the reigning prince of Potali was a vassal of the sovereign of Kāsi. In the *Sona-Nanda Jātaka*[9] Manoja, king of Benares, is said to have subdued the kings of Kosala, Aṅga and Magadha. In the

[1] *Mahāvagga*, X, 2. 3; *Vinaya Piṭakam*, I, 342.

[2] *Śat. Br.*, XIII. 5. 4. 19.

[3] No. 336.

[4] No 428.

[5] No. 536.

[6] *SBE.*, Vol. XIII, pp. 294-99.

[7] The reference in the *Mahābhārata* (I. 105. 47 ff; 106. 2. 13; 113. 43; 114. 3f; 126. 16; 127. 24) to Kāsi princesses, the mothers of Dhṛitarāshṭra and Pāṇḍu, as Kausalyā, possibly points to the traditional union of the two realms of Kāsi and Kosala in the period when part of the epic was compiled. The expression Kāsi-Kauśalya already occurs in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* (*Vedic Index*. I. 195).

[8] No. 207.

[9] No. 532.

Mahābhārata[1] Pratardana, king of Kāsi, is said to have crushed the power of the Vītahavyas or Haihayas.[2] In the absence of corroborative evidence it is difficult to say how far the account of the achievements of individual kings, mentioned in the *Jātakas* and the epic, is authentic. But the combined testimony of many *Jātakas* and the *Mahāvagga* clearly proves that Kāsi was at one time a great, almost an imperial power, stronger than many of its neighbours including Kosala.

We learn from the *Bhojājāniya Jātaka*[3] that "all the kings round coveted the kingdom of Benares." We are told that on one occasion seven kings encompassed Benares.[4] Benares in this respect resembled ancient Babylon and mediæval Rome, being the coveted prize of its more warlike but less civilized neighbours.

The Kingdom of **Kosala** as we have seen, was bounded on the west by the Gumti, on the south by the Sarpikā or Syandikā (Sai) river,[5] on the east by the Sadānīrā which separated it from Videha, and on the north by the Nepāl hills. It included the territory of the Kālāmas of Kesaputta,[6] possibly on the Gumti, and that of the Śākyas of Kapilavastu in the Nepalese Tarai. In the *Sutta Nipāta*[7] the Buddha says, "Just beside Himavanta there lives a people endowed with the power of wealth, the inhabitants of *Kosala.*[8] They are *Ādichchas*[9]

[1] XIII. 30.

[2] Dr Bhandarkar points out that several Kāsi monarchs, who figure in the *Jātakas*, are also mentioned in the *Purāṇas*, e.g., Vissasena of *Jātaka* No. 268. Udaya of *Jātaka* No. 458, and Bhallāṭiya of *Jātaka* No. 504 are mentioned in the *Purāṇas* as Vishvaksena, Udakasena and Bhallāṭa. *Matsya*, 49. 57 *et seq.* *Vāyu*, 99. 180 *et seq.*; *Vishṇu*, IV. 19. 13.

[3] No. 23.

[4] *Jātaka*, 181.

[5] Rām. II. 49. 11-12; 50. 1; VII. 104. 15.

[6] *Anguttara Nikāya*, I. 188 (PTS); *IC*. II. 808. In the *Ṛig-veda*, V, 61, the Dālbhyas, a family or clan closely connected with the Keśins (who possibly gave their name to Kesaputta), are placed on the Gumti.

[7] SBE., X, Part II, 68-69.

[8] *Kosalesu niketino.* As pointed out by Rhys Davids and Stede, *Niketin* means 'having an abode,' 'being housed,' 'living in,' *cf.* J. III, 432—*dumasākhā-niketinī.*

[9] Belonging to the Aditya (Solar) race (*cf.* Lüders, Ins., 929 i)

by family, Śākiyas by birth; from that family I have wandered out, not longing for sensual pleasures." The *Majjhima Nikāya*,[1] too, mentions the Buddha as a Kosalan:

"**Bhagavā pi Kosalako** *aham pi Kosalako*"

The political subjection of the Śākyas to the king of Kosala in the latter half of the sixth century B.C. is clear from the evidence of the *Aggañña Suttanta*[2] and the introductory portion of the *Bhaddasāla Jātaka*.[3]

Kosala proper contained three great cities, namely Ayodhyā, Sāketa and Sāvatthī or Śrāvastī, besides a number of minor towns like Setavyā[4] and Ukkaṭṭha.[5] Ayodhyā (Oudh) was a town on the river Sarayū now included in the Fyzabad district. Sāketa is often supposed to be the same as Ayodhyā, but Professor Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in the Buddha's time. They were possibly adjoining like London and Westminster.[6] Sāvatthī is the great ruined city on the south bank of the Achiravatī or Rāptī called Sāhēṭ-Māhēṭ, which is situated on the borders of the Goṇḍa and Bahraich districts of the present Uttar-Pradesh.[7]

In the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in the *Purāṇas* the royal family of Kosala is represented as being descended from a king named Ikshvāku. Branches of this family are represented as ruling at Kusinārā,[8] at Mithilā[9] and at Vīśālā or Vaiśālī.[10] A prince named Ikshvāku is mentioned in a passage of the

[1] II. 124

[2] *Dīgha Nikāya*, III (PTS), 83; *Dialogues*, III. 80.

[3] No. 465; Fausboll, IV. 145.

[4] *Pāyāsi Suttanta.*

[5] *Ambaṭṭha Sutta.*

[6] *Buddhist India*, p. 39.

[7] Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India*, 1924, 6. 469; Smith, E. H. I., 3rd ed., p. 159. The royal palace at Śrāvastī overlooked the Achiravatī (DPPN, II, 170n).

[8] The *Kuśa Jātaka*, No. 531. The *Mahāvastu* (III. 1) places an Ikshvāku king in Benares—*Abhūshi Rājā Ikshvāku Vārāṇasyāṁ mahābalo.*

[9] *Vāyu P.*, 89, 3.

[10] *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 4. 11-12.

Ṛig-Veda.[1] In the *Atharva-Veda*[2] either this king, or one of his descendants, is referred to as an ancient hero. The *Purāṇas* give lists of kings of the *Aikshvāka* dynasty from Ikshvāku himself to Prasenajit, the contemporary of Bimbisāra. The *names* of many of these kings are probably found in the Vedic literature. For example: —

Mandhātṛi Yuvanāśva[3] is mentioned in the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa.*[4] Purukutsa[5] is referred to in the *Ṛig-Veda.*[6] In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[7] he is styled an Aikshvāka.[8] Trasadasyu,[9] too, finds mention in the *Ṛig-Veda.*[10] Tryaruṇa[11] is also mentioned in the same *Veda.*[12] In the *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*[13] he is called an Aikshvāka Triśaṅku[14] is referred to in the *Taittirīya Upanishad.*[15]

Hariśchandra[16] figures in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[17] and is styled Aikshvāka. Rohita, the son of Hariśchandra[18] is also alluded to in the same *Brāhmaṇa.*[19] Bhagīratha[20] figures prominently in the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa* under the slightly different name of Bhageratha[21] and is called Aikshvāka and *'Ekarāṭ'* (sole ruler). Under the name of Bhajeratha he is probably referred to in the *Ṛig-Veda*[22] itself. Ambarīsha[23] is mentioned in the same *Veda.*[24] The name Ṛituparṇa[25] finds mention in a Brāhmaṇa-like passage of the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra.*[26] Daśaratha and Rāma[27] bear names that are known to the *Ṛig-Veda.*[28] But these personages and a few others men-

[1] X. 60. 4.
[2] XIV. 39. 9.
[3] *Vāyu* 88. 67.
[4] I. 2. 10 *et seq.*
[5] *Vāyu*, 88. 72.
[6] I. 63. 7; 112. 7, 14; 174. 2, VI. 20. 10.
[7] XIII. 5. 4. 5.
[8] *Cf.* reference to the *Ṛig-Veda*, IV. 42. 8 in this connection.
[9] *Vāyu*, 88. 74.
[10] IV. 38. 1; VII. 19. 3, etc.
[11] *Vāyu*, 88. 77.
[12] V. 27.
[13] XIII. 3. 12.
[14] *Vāyu*, 88. 109.
[15] I. 10. 1.
[16] *Vāyu*, 88. 117.
[17] VII. 13. 16.
[18] *Vāyu*, 88. 119.
[19] VII. 14
[20] *Vāyu*, 88. 167.
[21] IV. 6. 1 ff.
[22] X. 60. 2.
[23] *Vāyu*, 88. 171.
[24] I. 100. 17.
[25] *Vāyu*, 88. 173.
[26] XVIII. 12 (Vol. II, p. 357).
[27] *Vāyu*, 88. 183-184.
[28] I. 126. 4; X. 93. 14.

tioned above are not connected in the Vedic texts with the Ikshvāku family or with Kosala.

Hiraṇyanābha Kausalya,[1] is mentioned in the *Praśna Upanishad* as a *rājaputra* or prince.[2] He is undoubtedly connected with Para Āṭṇāra (Āhlāra), the Kosala-Videhan king, mentioned in a *gāthā* (song) occurring in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[3] and the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*,[4] as well as a passage of *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa*.[5] The *gāthā* as quoted in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* gives to Para the patronymic 'Hairaṇyanābha', while the *Śrauta Sūtra* identifies Para with Hiraṇyanābha himself. It is difficult to say whether the original *gāthā* extolling the deeds of Para Āṭṇāra (Āhlāra) gave to that conqueror the name 'Hiraṇyanābha' or the patronymic 'Hairaṇyanābha.' The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is the older of the two works mentioning the prince's exploits and is, therefore, more likely to preserve the original text than the *sūtra*. According to the *Praśna Upanishad*, Hiraṇyanābha, the father, was a contemporary of Sukeśā Bhāradvāja,[6] who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana.[7] If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Sāvatthī mentioned in the *Majjhima Nikāya*[8] as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha, he must be placed in sixth century B.C. Consequently Hiraṇyanābha and his son, Hairaṇyanābha too, must have flourished in that century.

[1] *Vāyu*, 88. 207.

[2] VI. 1. In the Jaim. Up. Br. II. 6. he (cf. *Śāṅkh. Śr. Sutra*, XVI. 9. 13) or his son (*Śat. Br.*, XIII. 5. 4. 4) is styled a *māhārāja*. Too much significance should not be attached to the designation *rājaputra* (as distinguished from *rājā*). In the Mbh. V. 165. 18, Bṛihadvala is a *rājā* of Kosala (Kausalya). In a later passage of the epic (XI. 25. 10) the same ruler is referred to as *Kosalānāmadhipatim rājaputraṁ Bṛihadbalam*.

[3] XIII. 5. 4. 4. *Aṭṇārasya Paraḥ putro'śvaṃ medhyamabandhayat*
Hairaṇyanābhaḥ Kausalyo diśaḥ pūrṇā amaṃhata (*iti*).

[4] XVI. 9. 13.

[5] II. 6.

[6] VI. 1.

[7] *Praśna*, I. 1.

[8] II. 147 *et seq.*

Some of the later princes of the Purāṇic list, *e.g.*, Śākya, Suddhodana, Siddhārtha, Rāhula and Prasenajit, are mentioned in Buddhist texts. The exact relations of Hiraṇyanābha (and Hairaṇyanābha) with Prasenajit, who also flourished in the sixth century B.C. are not known. The Purāṇic chroniclers make Hiraṇyanābha an ancestor of Prasenajit, but are not sure about his position in the dynastic list.[1] Further they refer to Prasenajit as the son and successor of Rāhula, and grandson of Siddhārtha (Buddha). This is absurd, because Prasenajit was of the same age as the Buddha and belonged to a different branch of the Ikshvāku line. The Tibetans represent him as the son of Brahmadatta.[2] It is clear that no unanimous tradition about the parentage of Prasenajit and the position of Hiraṇyanābha in the family tree has been preserved. Hiraṇyanābha, or preferably his son, performed an *Aśvamedha* sacrifice and was apparently a great conqueror. Is this ruler identical with the "Great Kosalan" (Mahākosala) of Buddhist tradition? If he really flourished in the sixth century B.C., he may have been identical with 'Mahākosala' of Buddhist texts.

Pargiter admits that several Purāṇic passages make Hiraṇyanābha (and therefore also his son) one of the "future" kings after the Bhārata battle.[3] He was the only prince of antiquity who is styled in the Vedic literature both a Kausalya and a Vaideha. That description admirably fits Mahākosala whose daughter, the mother of Ajātaśatru according to Buddhist tradition, is called Kosalādevī as well as Vedehī (Vaidehī).

A word may be added here regarding the value of the Purāṇic lists. No doubt they contain names of some real kings and princes. But they have many glaring defects, defects which are apt to be forgotten by writers who make these the basis of early Indian chronology.

[1] AIHT, 173.
[2] *Essay on Guṇāḍhya*, p 173
[3] AIHT, 173

(1) Ikshvākuids of different branches and perhaps princes of other tribes, *e.g.*, Trasadasyu, king of the Pūrus,[1] Ṛituparṇa, king of Śaphāla,[2] Śuddhodana of Kapilavastu and Prasenajit, king of Śrāvastī, have been mixed up in such a way as to leave the impression that they formed a continuous line of monarchs who ruled in regular succession.

(2) Contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals have been represented as lineal descendants, *e.g.*, Prasenajit, king of Śrāvastī, is represented as the lineal successor of Siddhārtha and Rāhula, though he was actually a contemporary of Siddhārtha, *i.e.*, the Buddha, and belonged to a separate line of the Ikshvākuids.

(3) Certain individuals have been omitted, *e.g.*, Vedhas (father, or ancestor of Hariśchandra), Para Āṭṇāra (unless he is identical with Hiraṇyanābha), and Mahākosala.

(4) Names in the list include Śākya, the designation of a clan, and Siddhārtha (Buddha) who never ruled.

It is not easy to find out all the kings of the Purāṇic chronicles who actually ruled over Kosala. Some of the earlier princes, *e.g.*, Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Hariśchandra, Rohita, Ṛituparṇa and a few others, are omitted from the list of the kings of Ayodhyā given in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[3] We gather from the Vedic literature that many, if not all, of these monarchs ruled over territories lying outside Kosala. The only kings or princes in the Purāṇic list who are known from the Vedic and early Buddhist texts to have reigned in Kosala, or over some outlving part of it, are Hiraṇyanābha,[4] Prasenajit and Śuddhodana.

[1] *Rig-Veda*, IV, 38. 1; VII 19 3.

[2] *Baud. Śrauta Sūtra*, XVIII. 12 (Vol II, p 357), *Āpas. Śr. Sūtra*, XXI 20. 3. Ṛituparṇa is, however, not distinctly called an Aikshvāka But from the rarity of the name it is possible to surmise that the epic and Purāṇic king of that designation is meant.

[3] I. 70.

[4] In the *Śat. Br.* XIII. 5. 4 4-5, Hairaṇyanābha is described as *Kausalya rāja*, but not as an Aikshvāka. On the other hand Purukutsa Daurgaha is styled *Aikshvāka-rājā* but not as *Kausalya*, as if a distinction between *Kausalyas*

The Buddhist works mention a few other sovereigns of Kosala, but their names do not occur in the epic and Purāṇic accounts. Some of these kings had their capital at Ayodhyā, others at Sāketa, and the rest at Śrāvastī. Of the princes of Ayodhyā, the *Ghaṭa Jātaka*[1] mentions Kālasena. A Kosalarāja reigning in Sāketa is mentioned in the *Nandiyamiga Jātaka*.[2] Vaṅka, Mahākosala and many others[3] had their capital at Sāvatthī or Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā seems to have been the earliest capital, and Sāketa the next. The last capital was Śrāvastī. Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town in the Buddha's time,[4] but Sāketa and Śrāvastī were included among the six great cities of India.[5]

The chronology of ancient Kosala is in a state of utmost confusion. If the *Purāṇas* are to be believed, a prince named Divākara occupied the throne of Ayodhyā in the time of Adhisīma-Kṛishṇa, great-great grandson of Parikshit. But, as has already been pointed out above, the princes who are mentioned as his successors did not form a continuous line of rulers who reigned over the same territory in regular succession. It is, therefore, a hopeless task to measure the distance separating him from the Buddha and his contemporary with the help of the traditional dynastic lists alone. It is also not known when the older capitals were abandoned in favour of Śrāvastī. But it must have been some time before the accession of Prasenajit, the contemporary of the Buddha, of Bimbisāra, and of Udayana of Kauśāmbī, supposed to be a descendant of Adhisīma-Kṛishṇa.

and *Aikshvākas* is meant. The two terms need not refer to kings of the same dynasty ruling over exactly the same territory. As a matter of fact Trasadasyu is known to be a king of the Pūrus. An Ikshvākuid styled Vārshṇa, connected with the Vṛishṇis (?), is mentioned in *Jaim. Up. Br.* 1. 5. 4.

[1] No. 454.

[2] No. 385.

[3] *E.g.*, the Kosalarāja of J. 75; Chatta (336); Sabbamitta (512); and Prasenajit.

[4] *Buddhist India*, p. 34.

[5] *Mahā-parinibbāna Sutta*, S.B.E., XI, p. 99.

We learn from the *Mahāvagga*[1] that during the period of the earlier Brahmadattas of Kāsi, Kosala was a poor and tiny state with slender resources: *Dīghīti nāma Kosala-rājā ahosi daliddo appadhano appadhogo appabalo appa-vāhano appavijito aparipuṇṇa-kosa-koṭṭhāgāro.*

In the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., however, Kosala was a mighty kingdom which contended first with Kāsi, and afterwards with Magadha for the mastery of the upper Ganges valley. The history of these struggles is reserved for treatment in later sections. The rivalry with Magadha ended in the absorption of the kingdom into the Magadhan Empire.

Aṅga was the country to the east of Magadha and west of the chieftains who dwelt in the Rajmahal Hills (*Parvatavāsinaḥ*). It was separated from Magadha (including Modāgiri or Monghyr) by the river Champā, probably the modern Chāndan.[2] The Aṅga dominions, however, at one time included Magadha and probably extended to the shores of the sea. The *Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka*[3] describes Rājagṛiha as a city of Aṅga. The *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*[4] refers to an Aṅga king who sacrificed on Mount Vishṇupada (probably at Gayā). The *Sabhā-parva*[5] mentions Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one *Vishaya* or kingdom. The *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* says[6] that Viṭaṅkapur, a city of the Aṅgas, was situated on the shore of the sea. The imperial glory of Aṅga is doubtless reflected in the

[1] S.B.E., XVII, p. 294.

[2] According to Pargiter (JASB, 1897, 95) Aṅga comprised the modern districts of Bhāgalpur and Monghyr, and also extended northwards up the river Kauśikī or Kośī and included the western portion of the district of Purnea. For it was on that river that Kāśyapa Vibhāṇḍaka had his hermitage. His son Ṛishyaśṛiṅga was beguiled by courtesans of Aṅga into a boat and brought down the river to the capital. In Mbh. ii. 30. 20-22, however, Modāgiri (Monghyr) and Kauśikī-Kachchha had rulers who are distinguished from Karṇa whose realm (Aṅga) clearly lay between the Māgadhas and the Rājās styled *Parvatavāsin*.

[3] No. 545.

[4] 29. 35, JASB, 1897, 94.

[5] 44. 9; *cf.* VI. 18. 28. Aṅgas and Prāchyas.

[6] 25. 35; 26. 115; 82. 3-16.

songs of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[1] which describe the 'world-conquest' (*Samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivīṁ jayan*) of one of its ancient kings in the course of which girls of aristocratic families (*āḍhya-duhitṛi*) were brought as prizes from different climes.

Champā, the famous capital of Aṅga, stood at the confluence of the river of the same name[2] and the Ganges.[3] Cunningham points out that there still exist near Bhāgalpur two villages, Champānagara and Champāpura, which most probably represent the actual site of the ancient capital. It is stated in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Purāṇas* and the *Harivaṁśa* that the ancient name of Champā was Mālinī:[4]

Champasya tu purī Champā
yā Mālinyabhavat purā.

In the *Jātaka* stories the city is also called Kāla-Champā. The *Mahā-Janaka Jātaka*[5] informs us that Champā was sixty leagues from Mithilā. The same *Jātaka* refers to its gate, watch-tower, and walls. Down to the time of Gautama Buddha's death it was considered as one of the six great cities of India, the other five being Rājagṛiha, Śrāvastī, Sāketa, Kauśāmbī, and Benares.[6] Champā was noted for its wealth and commerce, and traders sailed from it to Suvarṇa-bhūmi in the Trans-Gangetic region for trading purposes.[7] Hindu emigrants to southern Annam and Cochin China are supposed to have named their settlement after this famous Indian city.[8]

[1] *Ait Br* VIII. 22. [2] *Jātaka*, 506.

[3] Mbh., iii. *84*. 163; *307*. 26 (*Gaṅgāyāḥ Sūtavishayaṁ Champāmanu yayau purīm*); Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II. 181, *Daśakumāra Charita*, II. 2.

[4] *Matsya*, 48. 97. *Vāyu*, 99. 105-106; *Hariv.*, 31. 49; *Mbh.*, XII. 5. 6-7; XIII. 42. 16.

[5] No. 539 [6] *Mahā-parinibbāna Sutta*.

[7] *Jātaka*, 539, Fausboll's Ed , VI, p. 34

[8] *Ind. Ant.*, VI. 229, Itsing, 58, Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 35. Nundolal Dey, *Notes on Ancient Aṅga*, JASB, 1914. For the Hindu colonisation of Champā, see Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. III, pp. 137 ff. and R. C. Majumdar, *Champā*. The oldest Sanskrit inscription (that of Vo-can) dates, according to some scholars, from about the third century A.D. The insciption mentions a king of the family of Śrī Māra-rāja.

Other important cities in Aṅga were Assapura (Aśvapura) and Bhaddiya (Bhadrika).[1]

The earliest appearance of Aṅga is in the *Atharva Veda*[2] in connection with the Gandhāris, Mūjavats, and Magadhas. The *Rāmāyaṇa* tells an absurd story about the origin of this *Janapada*. It is related in that epic that Madana or Anaṅga, the god of love, having incurred the displeasure of the God Śiva fled from the hermitage of the latter to escape his consuming anger, and the region where "he cast off his body (*aṅga*)" has since been known by the name of Aṅga.[3] The *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* attribute the foundation of the kingdom to a *prince* named Aṅga.[4] The tradition may claim some antiquity as Aṅga Vairochana is included in the list of anointed kings in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*.[5] The consecration of this ruler with the Aryan ritual styled the *Aindra mahābhisheka* causes some surprise as the *Bodhāyana Dharma Sūtra* groups the Aṅgas with peoples of mixed origin, and the *Mahābhārata* brands an Aṅga prince who, by the way, is distinguished from Karṇa, and is described as skilful in handling elephants, as a *Mlechchha* or outlandish barbarian. In the *Matsya Purāṇa* the father of the eponymous hero of the Aṅgas is styled *Dānavarshabhaḥ* (chief among demons).[6]

[1] Malalasekera, *DPPN*, 16, *Dhammapada Commentary, Harvard Oriental Series*, 29, 59 Cf Bhaddiya (Bhaddika or Bhadrikā of Jaina writers). It is possibly represented by Bhadariyā, 8 miles south of Bhāgalpur (JASB, 1914, 337).

[2] V. 22, 14

[3] *JASB*, 1914, p 317; *Rām.*, I. 23. 14.

[4] *Mbh* 1 104. 53-54; *Matsya P.*, 48. 19.

[5] VIII. 22, cf Pargiter, JASB, 1897, 97. In connection with the gifts of the Aṅga King mention is made of a place called Avachatnuka:

Daśanāgasahasrāṇi dattvā'treyo' vachatnuke
śrāntaḥ pārikutān praiṛpsad dānen-Aṅgasya Brāhmaṇah.

The epithet 'Vairochana' given to the Aṅga King reminds one of 'Vairochani' of the *Matsya P.*, 48, 58.

[6] *Bodh. Dh. S.*, I. 1. 29; *Mbh.* VIII. 22. 18-19; *Mat. P.*, 48. 60. Note also the connection of Angas with *Nishādas* in *Vāyu*, 62, 107-23. The Purāṇa describes the royal family as *Atrivaṁśasamutpanna*. *In the Aitareya Brāhmana*, however, an Ātreya appears as the *priest* of the Aṅga King. For a discussion of the origin of the Aṅgas and other kindred tribes, see S. Lévi, *pre-Aryen et Pre-Dravidien dans l' Inde*, J. A. Juillet-septembre, 1923.

About the dynastic history of Aṅga our information is meagre. The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* refers to king Dhataraṭṭha of Aṅga.[1] The Buddhist texts mention a queen named Gaggarā who gave her name to a famous lake in Champā. The *Purāṇas*[2] give lists of the early kings of this country. One of these rulers, Dadhivāhana, is known to Jaina tradition. The *Purāṇas* and the *Harivaṁśa*[3] represent him as the son and immediate successor of Aṅga. Jaina tradition places him in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. His daughter Chandanā or Chandrabālā was the first female who embraced Jainism shortly after Mahāvīra had attained the *Kevaliship*.[4] Śatānīka, king of the Vatsas of Kauśāmbī, near Allahabad, is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Dadhivāhana; and in the confusion which ensued, Chandanā fell into the hands of a robber, but all along she maintained the vows of the order.

Between the Vatsas and the realm of Aṅga lived the Magadhas, then a comparatively weak people. A great struggle was going on between this kingdom and its great eastern neighbour.[5] The *Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka*[6] describes Rājagṛiha, the Magadhan capital, as a city of Aṅga while the *Mahābhārata* refers to a sacrifice which an Aṅga king probably performed at Gayā. These details may indicate that Aṅga succeeded in annexing Magadha. Its frontier thus approached the Vatsa Kingdom whose monarch's alarm may have been responsible for an attack on Champā. The Aṅga king preferred to have friendly relations with Kauśāmbī, possibly because he was threatened by the reviving power of Magadha. Śrī Harsha speaks of a ruler of Aṅga named Dṛiḍhavarman who gave

[1] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II. 270.
[2] *Matsya*, 48. 91. 108; *Vāyu*, 99. 100-112.
[3] 32. 43.
[4] *JASB*, 1914. pp. 320-21 For the story of Chandanabālā see also *Ind. Culture*, II. pp. 682 ff.
[5] *Champeyya Jātaka*.
[6] Cowell, VI. 133.

his daughter in marriage to Udayana, son and successor of Śatānīka[1] and secured his help in regaining his throne.

The success of Aṅga did not last long. About the middle of the sixth century B. C. Bimbisāra Śreṇika, the Crown Prince of Magadha, is said to have killed Brahmadatta, the last independent ruler of Ancient Aṅga. He took Champā, the capital, and resided there as his father's Viceroy.[2] Henceforth Aṅga becomes an integral part of the growing empire of Magadha.

Magadha corresponds roughly to the present Patna and Gayā districts of South Bihār. It seems to have been bounded on the north and the west by the rivers the Ganges and the Śon, on the south by spurs of the Vindhyan range, and on the east by the river Champā which emptied itself into the Ganges near the Aṅga capital.[3] Its earliest capital was Girivraja, the mountain-girt city,[4] or old Rājagṛiha, near Rājgir among the hills in the neighbourhood of Gayā. The *Mahāvagga*[5] calls it "Giribbaja of the Magadhas" to distinguish it from other cities of the same name, *e.g.*, Girivraja in Kekaya. The *Mahābhārata* refers to it not only as Girivraja, but as Rājagṛiha,[6] Bārhadratha-pura[7] and Māgadha-pura,[8] and says that it was an almost impregnable city, *puraṁ durādharshaṁ samantataḥ*, being protected by five hills, *viz.* Vaihāra, the grand rock (*Vipulaḥ śailo*), Varāha,

[1] *Priyadarśikā*, Act IV

[2] Hardy, *A Manual of Buddhism*, p 163n (account based on the Tibetan *Dulva*), *JASB*, 1914. 321.

[3] *Mbh.* II 20 29; *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta* (*Dialogues* ii. 94) and DPPN, I 331 which show that the Vriji frontier commenced from the northern bank of the Ganges as Ukkavelā or Ukkachelā, was included within the limits of that state, Champeyya Jātaka (506); Fleet, *CII*, 227; *DPPN*, 403. In the epic period the eastern boundary of Magadha proper may not have extended as far as the Champā river as Modāgiri (Monghyr) finds mention as a separate state

[4] Broadley in *JASB*, 1872, 299. Girivraja was at one time identified with Giryek on the Pañchana river about 36 miles north-east of Gayā, 6 miles east of Rājgir (Pargiter in JASB, 1897, 86).

[5] S. B. E., XIII. 150.

[6] Mbh I. 113 27; 204. 17; II 21. 34; III. 84, 104.

[7] II. 24. 44.

[8] *Gorathaṁ girimāsādya dadṛśur Māgadhaṁ puram*, II, 20, 30: 21. 13.

Vṛishabha, Ṛishigiri and Chaityaka[1] with their compact bodies (*rakshantīvābhisaṁhatya saṃhatāṅgā Girivrajam*). From the *Rāmāyaṇa* we learn that the city had another name, Vasumatī.[2] The *Life of Hiuen Tsang* mentions still another name, Kuśāgra-pura.[3] Indian Buddhist writers give a seventh name, Bimbasāra-purī.[4]

In a passage of the *Ṛig-Veda*[5] mention is made of a territory called Kīkaṭa ruled by a chieftain named Pramaganda. Yāska[6] declares that Kīkaṭa is the name of a non-Aryan country. In later works Kīkaṭa is given as a synonym of Magadha.[7]

Like Yāska the author of the *Bṛihad-dharma Purāṇa* apparently regarded Kīkaṭa as an impure country which however, included a few holy spots:—

Kīkaṭe nāma deśe' sti Kāka-karṇākhyako nṛipaḥ
prajānāṁ hitakṛinnityaṁ Brahma-dveshakarastathā
tatra deśe Gayā nāma puṇyadeśo' sti viśrutaḥ
nadī cha Karṇadā nāma pitṛīṇāṁ svargadāyinī[8]
Kīkaṭe cha mṛito' pyesha pāpabhūmau na saṁśayaḥ[9]

It is clear from these verses that Kīkaṭa included the Gayā district, but the greater part of it was looked upon

[1] The names given in the Pāli texts (DPPN, II, 721) are Pāṇḍava, Gijjhakūṭa, Vebhāra, Isigili and Vepulla (or Vaṅkaka). The Pāli evidence may suggest that *Vipula* in the *Mbh.* verse is a name, and not an epithet. In that case Dr. J. Wenger suggests *Chaityakapañchakāḥ* (five goodly *Chaityakas*) for *Chaityakapañchamā* (with Chaityaka as the fifth). For a note by Keith see IHQ, 1939, 163-64.

[2] I. 32. 8.

[3] P. 113. Apparently named after an early Magadhan prince (*Vāyu.* 99, 224; *AIHT*, 149).

[4] Law, *Buddhaghosha*, 87 n.

[5] III. 53. 14.

[6] *Nirukta*, VI, 32.

[7] *Kīkaṭeshu Gayā puṇyā punyaṁ Rājagṛihaṁ vanam*
Chyāvanasyāśramaṁ puṇyaṁ nadī puṇyā Punaḥpunā.
Cf. Vāyu, 108. 73; 105. 23. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, 1. 3. 24: *Buddho nāmnāñjanā-sutaḥ Kīkaṭeshu bhavishyati*: ibid. vii. 10, 19; Śrīdhara: "*Kīkaṭeshu madhye Gayā-pradeśe*". *Abhidhāna-chintāmani*: "*Kīkaṭā Magadhāhvayāḥ.*" For an epigraphic reference to Kīkata see *Ep. Ind. II.* 222, where a prince of that name is connected with the Maurya family. See also 'Kekaṭeyaka' (*Monuments of Sānchi*, I. 302).

[8] *Madhya-Khaṇḍam*, XXVI. 20, 22.

[9] XXVI 47; cf. *Vāyu P.* 78 22, *Pādma Pātālakhaṇḍa*, XI 45.

as an unholy region (*pāpabhūmi*, doubtless corresponding to the *anārya-nivāsa* of Yāska). Kāka-karṇa, of line 1, may be the same as Kāka-varṇa of the Śaiśunāga family.

The name Magadha first appears in the *Atharva-Veda*[1] where fever is wished away to the Gandhāris, Mūjavats, Aṅgas and Magadhas. The bards of Magadha are, however, mentioned as early as the *Yajur-Veda*.[2] They are usually spoken of in the early Vedic literature in terms of contempt. In the *Vrātya* book of the *Atharva Saṁhitā*,[3] the *Vrātya*, i.e., the Indian living outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism, is brought into very special relation to the *puṁśchalī* (harlot) and the *Māgadha*. "In the eastern region (*Prāchyāṁ diśi*)" faith is his harlot, *Mitra* his *Māgadha* (bard or panegyrist).[4] In the *Śrauta Sūtras* the equipment characteristic of the *Vrātya* is said to be given, when the latter is admitted into the Aryan Brāhmaṇical community, to the so-called Brāhmaṇas living in Magadha, *Brahmabandhu Māgadhadeśīya*.[5] The Brāhmaṇas of Magadha, are here spoken of in a disparaging tone as *Brahmabandhu*.[6] In the *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, however, the views of a *Magadhavāsī* Brāhmaṇa are quoted with respect. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhas in early times was due, according to Oldenberg[7], to the fact that the Magadhas were not wholly Brāhmaṇised. Pargiter suggests[8] that in Magadha the Aryans met and mingled with a body of invaders from the east by sea.

With the exception of Pramaganda no king of Magadha appears to be mentioned in the Vedic literature. The earliest dynasty of Magadha according to the

[1] V. 22. 14.

[2] *Vāj. Saṁ.* XXX. 5; *Vedic Index*, II. 116. For the connection of the Māgadhas with Magadha, see *Vāyu P. 62*. 147.

[3] XV. ii. 5—*Śraddhā Puṁśchalī Mitro Māgadho* ..etc.; Griffith, II. 186.

[4] Cf. Weber, *Hist. Ind. Lit.*, p. 112.

[5] *Vedic Index*, II, 116.

[6] Note also the expression *rājānaḥ kshatra-bandhavaḥ* applied to Magadhan *kings* in the Purāṇas (Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 22).

[7] *Buddha*, 400 n.

[8] *JASB*, 1897, 111; *JRAS*, 1908, pp. 851-53. *Bodh. Dh. Sūtra*, I. i. 29 refers to Aṅgas and Magadhas as *saṅkīrṇa-yonayaḥ*, "of mixed origin".

Mahābhārata[1] and the *Purāṇas* is that founded by Bṛihadratha, the son of Vasu Chaidya-Uparichara, and the father of Jarāsandha. *Rāmāyaṇa*[2] makes Vasu himself the founder of Girivraja or Vasumatī. A Bṛihadratha is mentioned twice in the *Ṛig-Veda*,[3] but there is nothing to show that he is identical with the father of Jarāsandha. The Purāṇas give lists of the "Bṛihadratha kings" from Jarāsandha's son Sahadeva to Ripuñjaya, and apparently make Senajit, seventh in descent from Sahadeva, the contemporary of Adhisīma-Kṛishṇa of the Pārikshita family and Divākara of the Ikshvāku line. But in the absence of independent external corroboration it is not safe to accept the Purāṇic chronology and order of succession of the princes as authentic.[4] Bṛihadrathas and certain princes of Central India are said to have passed away when Pulika (Puṇika) placed his son Pradyota on the throne of Avanti,[5] *i.e.*, the Ujjain territory. As Pradyota was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha, and as the Purāṇic passage, "*Bṛihadratheshvatīteshu Vītihotreshu-Avantishu*, 'when the Bṛihadrathas, Vītihotras and Avantis (or the Vītihotras in Avanti) passed away'," suggests that the events alluded to here were synchronous, it is reasonable to conclude that

[1] I. 63 30.

[2] I. 32. 7.

[3] I 36 18, X. 49. 6.

[4] *Cf. supra*, pp. 80 f, 104, discussion about later Vaideha and Kosalan kings. The number of 'the future Bṛihadrathas' is given as 16. 22 or 32, and the period of their rule, 723 or 1000 years (DKA, 17, 68). The last King Ripuñjaya or Ariñjaya (*ibid* 17, 96) reminds one of Arindama of the Pāli texts (*DPPN*, ii. 402).

[5] *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p 18 *cf.*, IHQ, 1930, p. 683. There is no reason to believe with the late authors of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* and certain corrupt passages of the *Purāṇas*, (IHQ, 1930, pp. 679, 691), that there was a Pradyota of Magadha distinct from Mahāsena of Avanti who is called Pradyota by several earlier writers, Buddhist as well as Brāhmaṇical. The use of the expression 'Avantishu' (*DKA*, 18) in the Purāṇic passage which refers to the dynastic revolution brought about by Pulika, the identity of the names of the Purāṇic family of Pradyota with those of the Avanti line of Mahāsena, and the mention in reference to Pradyota of the Purāṇas, of epithets like '*Praṇata-sāmanta*' and '*nayavarjita*' which remind one irresistibly of Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti as described in Buddhist literature, leave little room for doubt that the Pradyota of the Purāṇas and Pradyota of Avanti cannot be regarded as distinct entities.

the Bṛihadratha dynasty came to an end in the sixth century B.C.

Jaina writers mention two early kings of Rājagṛiha named Samudra-vijaya and his son Gaya.[1] Gaya is said to have reached perfection which had been taught by the Jinas. But little reliance can be placed on uncorroborated assertions of this character.

The second Magadhan dynasty, according to the less corrupt texts of the Purāṇas, was the Śaiśunāga line which is said to have been founded by a king named Śiśunāga. Bimbisāra, the contemporary of the Buddha, is assigned to this family. Aśvaghosha, an earlier authority,[2] refers however, in his *Buddha-charita*[3] to Śreṇya, *i.e.*, *Bimbisāra*, as a scion, not of the Śaiśunāga dynasty, but of the **Haryaṅka-kula,** and the *Mahāvaṁśa* makes 'Susunāga', *i.e.*, Śiśunāga, the founder of a distinct line of rulers which *succeeded* that of Bimbisāra. The *Purāṇas* themselves relate that Śiśunāga "will take away the glory of the Pradyotas" whom we know from other sources to be contemporaries of the Bimbisārids: —

Ashṭa-triṁśachchhataṃ bhāvyāḥ
Pradyotāḥ pañcha te sutāḥ
hatvā teshāṁ yaśaḥ kṛitsnaṁ
Śiśunāgo bhavishyati.[4]

If this statement be true, then Śiśunāga must be later than the first Pradyota, namely Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena, who was, judged by the evidence of the Pāli texts, which is *confirmed* in important details by the ancient Sanskrit poets and dramatists,[5] a contemporary of Bimbisāra and his son. It follows that Śiśunāga according to the last-mentioned authorities, must be *later than* those kings.

[1] S.B.E. XLV. 86. A king named Gaya is mentioned in *Mbh.*, vii. 64. But he is described there as a son of Amūrtarayas.

[2] Aśvaghosha was a contemporary of Kanishka (*c.* 100 A.D.) (Winternitz, *Ind. Lit.*, II. 257). On the other hand the Purāṇic chronicles pre-suppose Gupta rule in the Ganges Valley (*DKA*, 53), *c.* 320 A.D.

[3] XI. 2; Raychaudhuri, *IHQ*, I. (1925), p. 87.

[4] *Vāyu Purāṇa*, 99; 314.

[5] *Indian Culture*, VI. 411.

But we have seen above that the Purāṇas make Śiśunāga *an ancestor* of Bimbisāra and the progenitor of *his* family. This part of the Purāṇic account is not corroborated by independent external evidence.[1] The inclusion of Vārāṇasī and Vaiśālī within Śiśunāga's dominions[2] proves that he came after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru who were the first to establish Magadhan rule in those regions. The *Mālālaṅkāravatthu*, a Pali work of modern date, but following very closely the more ancient books, tells us that Śiśunāga had a royal residence at Vaiśālī which ultimately became his capital.[3] "That monarch (Śiśunāga) not unmindful of his mother's origin[4] re-established the city of Veśālī (Vaiśālī), and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagṛiha lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered. The last statement indicates that Śiśunāga came after the palmy days of Rājagṛiha, *i.e.*, the period of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. It may be argued that the Purāṇas make Girivraja, and not Vaiśālī, the abode of Śiśunāga (*Vārāṇasyāṁ sutaṁ sthāpya śrayishyati Girivrajam*); and as Udāyin, son of Ajātaśatru was the first to transfer the capital from that stronghold to the newly founded city of Pāṭaliputra, Śiśunāga's residence in the older capital points to a date earlier than that of the founder of the more famous metropolis. But the fact that Kālāśoka, son and successor of Śiśunāga, is known to have ruled in Pāṭaliputra shows that he came *after* Udāyin, the founder of that city. The further fact of removal of

[1] We may go even further and characterise certain statements of the Purāṇic bards as self-contradictory. Thus (*a*) Pradyota is said to have been anointed when the Vītihotras *had passed away*, (*b*) Śiśunāga destroyed the prestige of the Pradyotas and became king, *and yet* (*c*) contemporaneously with *these Śaiśunāga kings* 20 Vītihotras (and other lines) are said to have endured *the same* time.

ete sarve bhavishyanti
ekakālaṁ mahīkshitaḥ (*DKA*, 24).

[2] *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, 21; *S.B.E.*, XI, p. xvi.

[3] If the *Dvātriṁśat-Puttalikā* is to be believed, Vaiśālī continued to be graced by the presence of the king till the time of the Nandas.

[4] Śiśunāga, according to the *Mahāvaṁśaṭīkā* (Turnour, *Mahāwaṁsa*, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi *rāja* of Vaiśālī. He was conceived by a *nagaraśobhinī* and brought up by an officer of state.

capital in his reign too—which must be regarded as a second transfer[1]—shows that his predecessor had reverted to the older stronghold apparently as a place of refuge. The event alluded to in the words "*śrayishyati Girivrajam*" need not necessarily imply that Girivraja continued to be the capital uninterruptedly till the days of Śiśunāga.

The origin of the Haryaṅka line, to which Bimbisāra belonged according to Aśvaghosa, is wrapped up in obscurity. There is no cogent reason why this dynastic designation should be connected with Haryaṅga of Champā mentioned in the *Harivaṁśa*[2] and the Purāṇas. *Haryaṅka-kula* may simply be an expression like "*aulikara-lāñchhana ātma-vaṁśa*" of a Mandasor Inscription, pointing to the distinctive mark or emblem of the family.[3] Bimbisāra was not the founder of the line. The *Mahāvaṁśa* states that he was anointed king by his own father when he was only 15 years old.[4] He avenged a defeat of his father[5] by the Angas and launched Magadha into that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kaliṅga.

The **Vajji** (Vṛiji) territory lay north of the Ganges and extended as far as the Nepāl hills. On the west the river Gaṇḍak possibly separated it from the Mallas and perhaps also the Kosalas. Eastwards, it may have approached the forests that skirted the river Kośī and the Mahānandā. It

[1] SBE, XI, p. xvi.

[2] 31, 49; *Vāyu*, 99, 108; J.C. Ghosh in ABORI, 1938 (xix), pp. 1. 82.

[3] Hari has the sense of 'yellow', 'horse', 'lion', 'snake', etc.

[4] Geiger's translation, p. 12. This disposes of the view of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (*Carm. Lec.*, 1918) who makes Bimbisāra the founder of his dynasty and says that he was a general who carved out a kingdom for himself at the expense of the Vajjis.

[5] Turnour, N. L. Dey and others mention Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya as the name of the father. The Tibetans, on the other hand, call him *Mahāpadma*. Turnour, *Mahāwamśa*, I p. 10; *J. A. S. B.*, 1872, i. 298; 1914, 321; *Essay on Guṇāḍhya*, p. 173. The *Purāṇas* name Hemajit, Kshemajit, Kshetrojā or Kshatraujā as the father of Bimbisāra. If the Purāṇic account is correct Bhātiya or Bhaṭṭiya may have been a secondary name or epithet comparable to the names 'Seniya' and Kūṇiya of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru respectively. But it is not safe to rely on an uncorroborated statement of the Purāṇas, particularly when there is hardly any unanimity with regard to the form of the name.

is said to have included eight confederate clans (*aṭṭhakula*), of whom the old *Videhas*, the *Lichchhavis*, the *Jñātṛikas* and the *Vṛijis* proper were the most important. The identity of the remaining clans remains uncertain. It may, however, be noted that in a passage of the *Sūtrakṛitāṅga*, the *Ugras*, the *Bhogas*, the *Aikshvākas* and the *Kauravas* are associated with the Jñātṛis and the Lichchhavis as subjects of the same ruler and members of the same assembly.[1] The *Aṅguttara Nikāya*,[2] too, refers to the close connection of the Ugras with Vaiśālī, the capital of the Vṛijian confederation.

The old territory of the **Videhas** had, as already stated in an earlier section, its capital at Mithilā which has been identified with Janakpur within the Nepāl border. The *Rāmāyaṇa* clearly distinguishes it from the region round Vaiśālī.[3] But in Buddhist and Jaina texts the distinction is not always maintained and Videha is used in a wider sense to include the last-mentioned area.[4]

The **Lichchhavi** capital was definitely at Vaiśālī which is represented by modern Besarh (to the east of the Gaṇḍak) in the Muzaffarpur district of Bihār. It is probably identical with the charming city called Viśālā in the epic.[5]

Viśālāṁ nagarīṁ ramyāṁ divyāṁ svargopamāṁ tadā.

We learn from the introductory portion of the *Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka*[6] that a triple wall encompassed the town, each wall a league distant from the next, and there were three gates with watch-towers.

The Lichchhavi territory may have extended northwards as far as Nepāl where we find them in the seventh century A.D.

[1] S. B. E., XLV, 339. cf. Hoernle, *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II. p. 138, fn. 304.
[2] I. 26; III. 49; IV. 208.
[3] *Rām* I. 47-48.
[4] The *Achārāṅga Sūtra* (II. 15, § 17, S. B. E., XXII, Intro.) for instance places the *Saṁniveśa* of Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī *in Videha*. The mothers of Mahāvīra and Ajātaśatru are called Videha-dattā and Vedehī (Vaidehī) respectively.
[5] *Rām. Ādi*, 45. 10.
[6] No. 149.

The **Jñātrikas** were the clan of Siddhārtha and his son Mahāvīra, the *Jina*. They had their seats at Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma and Kollāga, suburbs of Vaiśālī. In the *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta*,[1] however, the abode of the "Nādīkas" (identified by Jacobi with the Nātikas or Jñātṛikas)[2] is distinguished from Koṭigāma (Kuṇḍagrāma?). Though dwelling in suburban areas Mahāvīra and his fellow clansmen were known as "Vesālie," *i.e.*, inhabitants of Vaiśālī.[3]

The **Vrijis** proper are already mentioned by Pāṇini.[4] Kauṭilya[5] distinguishes them from the 'Lichchhivikas'. Yuan Chwang[6] too, draws a distinction between the *Fu-li-chih* (Vṛiji) country and *Fei-she-li* (Vaiśālī). It seems that Vṛiji was not only the name of the confederacy but also of one of its constituent clans. But the Vṛijis, like the Lichchhavis, are often associated with the city of Vaiśālī (including its suburbs) which was not only the capital of the Lichchhavi clan, but also the metropolis of the entire confederacy.[7] A Buddhist tradition quoted by Rockhill[8] mentions the city proper as consisting of three districts. These districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans. The remaining peoples of the confederacy, *viz.*, the **Ugras, Bhogas, Kauravas, and Aikshvākas** resided in suburbs, and in villages or towns like Hatthigāma, Bhoganagara, etc.[9]

[1] Ch. 2.

[2] S. B. E. XXII, Intro.

[3] Hoernle *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, p. 4 n.

[4] IV. 2. 131.

[5] *Arthaśāstra*, Mysore Edition, 1919, p. 378.

[6] Watters, II, 81. *Cf.* also *DPPN*, II. 814; *Gradual sayings*, III. 62; IV. 10. According to Smith (Watters, II. 340) the Vṛiji country is roughly equivalent to the northern part of the Darbhanga district and the adjacent Nepalese Tarāi.

[7] *Cf. Majjhima Nikāya*, II, 101: *The Book of the Kindred Sayings, I.* (*Samyutta Nikāya*), by Mrs. Rhys Davids, p. 257—"A certain brother of the Vajjian clan was once staying *near* Vesālī in a certain forest tract".

[8] *Life of Buddha*, p. 62.

[9] For the *Ugras* and *Bhogas* see Hoernle, *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, p. 139 (210); *Bṛih. Up.* III. 8. 2; S. B. E., XLV, 71n, in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, I. 26 (Nipāta I. 14. 6), the *Ugras* are associated with Vaiśālī (*Uggo gahapati Vesāliko*), and

We have seen that during the Brāhmaṇa period Videha (Mithilā) had a monarchical constitution. The *Rāmāyaṇa*[1] and the *Purāṇas*[2] state that *Viśālā*, too, was at first ruled by "kings". The founder of the Vaiśālika dynasty is said to have been Viśāla, a son of Ikshvāku according to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, a descendant of Nabhāga the brother of Ikshvāku, according to the *Purāṇas*. Viśāla is said to have given his name to the city. After him came Hemachandra, Suchandra, Dhūmrāśva, Sṛiñjaya, Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākutstha and Sumati. We do not know how many of these Vaiśālika "kings" (*nṛipas*) can be accepted as historical and as having actually ruled as *monarchs in North Bihār*. A king named Sahadeva Śārñjaya is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[3] In the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[4] he is mentioned with Somaka-Sāhadevya. None of these kings, however, are connected with Vaiśālī in the Vedic literature. The *Mahābhārata* speaks of a Sahadeva (son of Sṛiñjaya) as sacrificing on the Jumna,[5] and not on the Gaṇḍak. The presence of Ikshvākuids as a constituent element of the Vṛijian confederacy, which had its metropolis at Vaiśālī, is, however, as already stated, suggested by the *Sūtrakṛitāṅga*.

The Vṛijian confederation must have been organised after the decline and fall of the royal houses of Videha. Political evolution in India thus resembles closely the developments in the ancient cities of Greece where also

in IV. 212 with Hatthigāma. A city of Ugga is mentioned in the *Dhammapada commentary*, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 30, 184. Hoernle refers (*Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, App. III, 57) to a place called Bhoganagara, or 'City of the *Bhogas*'. The *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta* mentions Bhaṇḍagāma, Hatthigāma, Ambagāma, Jambugāma and Bhoganagara on the way from Vaisālī to Pāvā (Digha, II, 122-26). *Cf.* also *Sutta Nipāta*, 194. The association of a body of *Kauravas* with the Vajjian group of clans is interesting. Kuru Brāhmaṇas, *e.g.*, Ushasti *Chākrāyaṇa* had begun to settle in the capital of Videha long before the rise of Buddhism. For the *Aikshvākas* of Vaisāli, see *Ram.* I. 47, 11.

[1] I. 47. 11. 17.

[2] *Vāyu*, 86. 16-22; *Vishṇu*, IV. 1. 18.

[3] II. 4. 4. 3-4.

[4] VII. 34. 9.

[5] *Mbh.* III. 90. 7. with commentary.

the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics. The probable causes of the transformation in Greece are thus given by Bury: "In some cases gross misrule may have led to the violent deposition of a king; in other cases if the succession to the sceptre devolved upon an infant or a paltry man, the nobles may have taken it upon themselves to abolish the monarchy. In some cases, the rights of the king might be strictly limited in consequence of his seeking to usurp undue authority; and the imposition of limitations might go on until the office of the king, although maintained in name, became in fact a mere magistracy in a state wherein the real power had passed elsewhere. Of the survival of monarchy in a limited form we have an example at Sparta; of its survival as a mere magistracy, in the Archon Basileus at Athens."

The cause of the transition from monarchy to republic in Mithilā has already been stated. Regarding the change at Viśālā we know nothing.

Several scholars have sought to prove that the Lichchhavis, the most famous clan of the Vṛijian confederacy (*Vajjiraṭṭhavāśi hi pasatthā*)[1], were of foreign origin. According to Smith they had Tibetan affinities. He infers this from their judicial system and the disposal of their dead, *viz.*, exposing them to be devoured by wild beasts.[2] Pandit S. C. Vidyābhūshaṇa held that the name Lichchhavi (Nichchhivi of Manu) was derived from the

[1] *DPPN*, II, 814.

[2] *Ind. Ant.*, 1903, p. 233 ff. In the case of Tibet we have only three courts as against the seven tribunals of the Lichchhavis (*viz.* those of the *Vinichchhaya mahamattas*) (inquiring magistrates), the *Vohārikas* (jurist-judges), *Suttadharas* (masters of the sacred code), the *Aṭṭhakulakas* (the eight clans, possibly a federal court), the *Senāpati* (general), the *Uparāja* (Viceroy or Vice-Consul), and the *rājā* (the ruling chief) who made their decisions according to the *paveṇi potthaka* (Book of Precedents). Further, we know very little about the relative antiquity of the Tibetan procedure as explained by S. C. Das which might very well have been suggested by the system expounded in the *Aṭṭhakathā*. This fact should be remembered in instituting a comparison between Tibetan and Vajjian practices. Regarding the disposal of the dead attention may be invited to the ancient practices of the 'Indus' people (Vats, *Excavations at Harappā*, I. ch. VI.) and the epic story in *Mbh.* IV. 5. 28-33.

Persian city of Nisibis.[1] The inadequacy of the evidence on which these surmises rest has been demonstrated by several writers.[2] Early Indian tradition is unanimous in representing the Lichchhavis as Kshatriyas. Thus we read in the *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta*: "And the Lichchhavis of Vesālī heard the news that the Exalted One had died at Kusinārā. And the Lichchhavis of Vesālī sent a messenger to the Mallas, saying: 'The Exalted One was a Kshatriya and so are we. We are worthy to receive a portion of the relics of the Exalted One." In the Jaina *Kalpa Sūtra* Triśalā, sister to Cheṭaka of Vesālī, is styled *Kshatriyāṇī*.[3]

Manu concurs in the view that the Lichchhavis are *Rājanyas* or *Kshatriyas*.[4]

Jhallo Mallaścha rājanyād vrātyān Nichchhivireva cha
Naṭaścha Karaṇaśchaiva Khaso Drāviḍa eva cha.

It may be argued that the Lichchhavis, though originally non-Aryans or foreigners, ranked as Kshatriyas when they were admitted into the fold of Brāhmaṇism like the Drāviḍians referred to in Manu's *śloka* and the Gurjara-Pratīhāras of mediæval times. But unlike the Pratīhāras and Dravidas, the Lichchhavis never appear to be very friendly towards the orthodox form of Hinduism. On the contrary, they were always to be found among the foremost champions of non-Brāhmaṇical creeds like Jainism and Buddhism. Manu testifies to their heterodoxy when he brands them as the children of the *Vrātya Rājanyas*. The great mediæval Rājput families (though sometimes descended from foreign immigrants) were never spoken of in these terms. On the contrary, they were

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1902, 143, ff; 1908, p. 78. There is very little in Vidyābhūshana's surmise except a fancied resemblance between the names Nichchhivi and Nisibis. Inscriptions of the Achaemenids are silent about any Persian settlement in Eastern India in the sixth or fifth century B.C. The Lichchhavi people were more interested in Yaksha *Chaityas* and the teaching of Mahāvīra and the Buddha *than in the deities and prophets of Irān.*

[2] *Modern Review*, 1919, p. 50; Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes*, 26ff.

[3] *SBE*, XXII, pp. xii, 227.

[4] X, 22.

supplied with pedigrees going back to Śrī Rāma, Lakshmaṇa, Yadu, Arjuna and others. A body of foreigners who did not observe ceremonies enjoined in the Brāhmaṇic code, could hardly have been accepted as Kshatriyas. The obvious conclusion seems to be that the Lichchhavis were indigenous Kshatriyas who were degraded to the position of *Vrātya* when they neglected Brāhmaṇic rites and showed a predilection for heretical doctrines. The *Rāmāyaṇa,* as we have seen, represents the Vaiśālika rulers as Ikshvākuids. The Pāli commentary *Paramatthajotikā*[1] traces their origin to Benares. The comparison of the Lichchhavis to the "Tāvatiṁsa gods" hardly accords with the theory that represents them as kinsmen of snub-nosed peoples who lived beyond the Himalayas.[2] "Let those of the brethren" we are told by a personage of great eminence "who have never seen the *Tāvatiṁsa* gods, gaze upon this company of the Lichchhavis, behold this company of the Lichchhavis, compare this company of the Lichchhavis—even as a company of *Tāvatiṁsa* gods."

The date of the foundation of the Lichchhavi power is not known. But it is certain that the authority of the clan was well established in the days of Mahāvīra and Gautama, in the latter half of the sixth century B.C., and was already on the wane in the next century.

Buddhist tradition has preserved the names of eminent Lichchhavis like prince Abhaya, Oṭṭhaddha (Mahāli), generals Sīha and Ajita, Dummukha and Sunakkhatta.[3] In the introductory portion of the *Ekapaṇṇa*[4] and *Chulla Kāliṅga*[5] *Jātakas* it is stated that the Lichchhavis of the ruling

[1] Vol. I, pp. 158-65.

[2] S. B E., XI, p. 32; DPPN, II, 779.

[3] *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* Nipāta III, 74 (P. T. S., Part I, p. 220 f.); *Mahāli Sutta, Dialogues of the Buddha,* Part I, p. 198, Part III, p. 17. *Mahāvagga.* S. B. E , XVII, p. 108; *Majjhima N.,* I. 234; 68; II. 252; *The book of the Kindred Sayings,* I, 295. For a detailed account of the Lichchhavis, see now Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes of Ancient India.*

[4] 149.

[5] 301,

family numbered 7,707.[1] There was a like number of viceroys, generals, and treasurers. Too much importance should not be attached to these figures which are merely traditional and may simply point to the large number of *mahallakas*[2] or elders in the clan. The real power of administration especially in regard to foreign affairs seems to have been vested in a smaller body of nine *Gaṇarājās* or archons. The Jaina *Kalpasūtra*[3] refers to the **nine Lichchhavis** as having formed a league with nine Mallakis and eighteen clan-lords of Kāśī-Kośala.[4] We learn from the *Nirayāvalī Sūtra* that an important leader of this alliance was Cheṭaka, whose sister Triśalā or Videha dattā was the mother of Mahāvīra, and whose daughter Chellanā or Vaidehī was, according to Jaina writers, the mother of Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru.

[1] Another tradition puts the number at 68,000 (DPPN, II 781 n). The *Dhammapada Commentary* (Harvard Oriental Series, 30, 168) informs us that the *rājās* ruled by turns.

[2] *Cf.* The Vajji Mahallakā referred to in *Dīgha*, II. 74, *Aṅguttara*. IV. 19.

[3] § 128.

[4] *Nava Mallaī (Mallatī) nava Lechchhaī (Lechchhatī) Kāsī Kosatagā* (variant *Kosalakā*) *aṭṭhārasa vi gaṇarāyāno.*

The *Kalpasūtra* of Bhadrabāhu, ed by Hermann Jacobi, 1879, *Jinacarita*, p. 65 (§ 128); *Nirayāvaliyā Suttam* (Dr S Warren), 1879, § 26; *SBE*. XXII, 1884, p. 266.

Dr. Barua is inclined to identify the nine Lichchhavis and the nine Mallakis with the eighteen *ganarājās* who belonged to Kāśī and Kośala He refers in this connection to the *Kalpadrumakalikāvyākhyā* which represents the Mallakis as *adhipas* (or overlords) of Kāśī-deśa, and the "Lechchhakis" as *adhipas* of Kośala-deśa, and further describes them as *sāmantas* or vassals of Cheṭaka, maternal uncle of Mahāvīra (*Indian Culture*, Vol. II. p. 810). It is news to students of Indian history that in the days of Mahāvīra the kingdoms of Kāśī and Kośala acknowledged the supremacy of the Mallas and Lichchhavis respectively, and formed part of an empire over which Chetaka presided. Even Dr. Barua hesitates to accept this interpretation of the late Jaina commentator in its entirety and suggests that the nine Mallas and the nine Lichchhavis ...derived their family prestige from their original connection with the dynasties of Kāśī and Kośala The *Paramattha-jotikā* (Khuddaka-pāṭha commentary), however, connects the Lichchhavis not with the dynasty of Kośala but with that of Kāśī. The divergent testimony of these late commentators shows that they can hardly be regarded as preserving genuine tradition. There is no suggestion in any early Buddhist or Jaina *text* that either the Lichchhavis or the Mallas actually ruled over any *grāma* or *nigama* in *Kāśī-Kośala* (see *Indian Culture*, II, 808). The *gaṇarājās* of *Kāśī-Kosala* apparently refer to the Kālāmas, Śākyas and other clans in the Kośalan empire.

The league was aimed against Magadha. Tradition says that even in the time of the famous Bimbisāra the Vaiśālians were audacious enough to invade their neighbours across the Ganges.[1] In the reign of Ajātaśatru the tables were turned, and the great confederacy of Vaiśālī was utterly destroyed.[2]

The **Malla** territory, ancient *Malla-raṭṭha*, the *Malla-rāshṭra* of the *Mahābhārata*,[3] was split up into two main parts which had for their capitals the cities of Kusāvatī or Kusinārā and Pāvā.[4] The river Kakutthā, the Cacouthes of the classical writers, identified with the modern Kuku, probably formed the dividing line.[5] The division of the people is also known to the great epic[6] which draws a distinction between the Mallas proper and the Dakshiṇa or Southern Mallas. There is no agreement among scholars regarding the exact site of **Kusinārā.** In the *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta* it is stated that the *Sāla* Grove of the Mallas, the *Upavattana* (outskirt or suburb)[7] of Kusinārā, lay near the river Hiraṇyavatī. Smith identifies the stream with the Gaṇḍak and says that Kuśīnagara (Kusinārā) was situated in Nepāl, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the Little, or Eastern Rāptī with the Gaṇḍak.[8] He, however, admits that the discovery in the large *stūpa* behind the *Nirvāṇa* temple near Kasiā on the Choṭa Gaṇḍak, in the east of the Gorakhpur district, of an inscribed copper-plate bearing the words "[*parini*]*r vāṇa-chaitye tāmrapaṭṭa iti*,"[9] supports the old theory, propounded by Wilson and accepted by Cunningham, that the remains near Kasiā represent Kuśī-nagara.

[1] *Si-yu-ki*, Bk. IX.

[2] *DPPN*, II. 781-82.

[3] VI. 9. 34.

[4] *Kusa Jātaka*, No. 531; *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta*, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part II, pp. 136 ff, 161-62.

[5] *AGI* (1924), 714.

[6] *Mbh.*, *II.* 30. 3 and 12.

[7] *JRAS*, 1906, 659; *Dīgha*, II. 137.

[8] *EHI*, third ed., p. 159 n.

[9] *ASI*, *A. R.* 1911-12, 17 ff; *JRAS*, 1913, 152. *Kasiā* is a village that lies about 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (*AGI*, 493).

Pāvā was identified by Cunningham[1] with the village named Padaraona, 12 miles to the N.N.E. of Kasiā, and separated from it by the Bādhi Nala (identified with the ancient Kakutthā). Carlleyle, however, proposes to identify Pāvā with Fāzilpur, 10 miles S.E. of Kasiā and separated from it by the Kuku.[2] In the *Saṅgīti Suttanta* we have a reference to the Mote Hall of the Pāvā Mallas named Ubbhaṭaka.[3]

The Mallas together with the Lichchhavis are classed by Manu as *Vrātya* Kshatriyas. They, too, like their eastern neighbours were among ardent champions of Buddhism.

Like Videha, Malla had at first a monarchical constitution. The *Kusa Jātaka* mentions a Malla king named Okkāka (Ikshvāku). The name probably suggests that like the Śākyas[4] the Malla princes also claimed to belong to the Ikshvāku family. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the *Mahā-parinibbāna Suttanta* they are sometimes called Vāseṭṭhas, *i.e.*, "belonging to the Vasishṭha *gotra*."[5] The *Mahāsudassana Sutta* mentions another king named Mahāsudassana.[6] These rulers, Okkāka and Mahāsudassana, may or may not have been historical individuals. But the tales that cluster round their names imply that Mallaraṭṭha was at first ruled by kings. This conclusion is confirmed by the evidence of the *Mahābhārata*[7] which **refers** to an overlord (*adhipa*) of the Mallas. During the monarchical period the metropolis was a great city and was styled Kusāvatī. Other important cities were Anupiyā and Uruvelakappa.[8]

[1] *AGI*, 1924, 498.

[2] Kukutthā; *AGI*., 1924, 714.

[3] *DPPN*, II. 194

[4] *Cf. Dialogues*, Part I, pp. 114-15.

[5] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part II, pp. 162, 179, 181. Vasishṭha figures in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the *purohita* of the Ikshvākuids.

[6] *S. B. E.*, XI, p. 248.

[7] II. 30. 3.

[8] Law, *Some Kṣatriya Tribes*, p. 149. *Dialogues*, Pt. III (1921), 7; *Gradual Sayings*, IV. 293. Anupiyā stood on the banks of the river Anomā which lay thirty leagues to the east of Kapilavastu. It was here that the

Before Bimbisāra's time the monarchy had been replaced by republics[1] and the chief metropolis had sunk to the level of a "little wattel and daub town," a "branch township" surrounded by jungles.[2] It was then styled Kusinārā.

The relations of the Mallas with the Lichchhavis were sometimes hostile and on other occasions friendly. The introductory story of the *Bhaddasāla Jātaka*[3] contains an account of a conflict between Bandhula the Mallian, Commander-in-chief of the king of Kośala, and 500 elders of the Lichchhavis. The Jaina *Kalpasūtra*, however, refers to "nine Mallakis" as having combined with the Lichchhavis, and the seigniors of Kāsi-Kośala against Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru who, like Philip of Macedon, was trying to absorb the territories of his republican neighbours. The Malla territory was finally annexed to Magadha. It certainly formed a part of the Maurya Empire in the third century B.C.

Chedi was one of the countries encircling the Kurus, *paritaḥ Kurūn*, and lay near the Jumna.[4] It was closely connected with the Matsyas beyond the Chambal, the Kāśis of Benares, and the Kārushas in the valley of the Śon,[5] and is distinguished from the Daśārṇas who lived on the banks of the Dhasan.[6] In ancient times it corresponded roughly to the eastern part of modern Bundelkhand and some

future Buddha cut off his hair and put on the robes of the ascetics. (*DPPN*, I, 81, 102).

[1] *Cf.* *S. B. E.*, XI, p. 102, Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 378.

[2] *Khudda-nagaraka, ujjaṅgala-nagaraka, sākhā-nagaraka.*

[3] No. 465.

[4] Pargiter, *JASB*, 1895, 253 ff, *Mbh.* I. 63. 2-58, IV. i. 11.

Santi ramyā janapadā
bahvannāḥ paritaḥ Kurūn
Pañchālāś-Chedi-Matsyāścha
Śūrasenāḥ Paṭachcharāḥ
Daśārṇā Navarāshṭrāścha
Mallāḥ Sālvā Yugandharāḥ.

[5] *Mbh.* V. 22, 25; 74. 16; 198. 2; VI. 47. 4; 54. 8.

[6] Princesses of Daśārṇa were given in marriage to Bhīma of Vidarbha and Vīrabāhu or Subāhu of Chedi (*Mbh.* III, 69. 14-15).

adjoining tracts.[1] In the mediæval period, however, the southern frontiers of Chedi extended to the banks of the Narmadā (*Mekala-Sutā*): —

Nadīnāṁ Mekala-sutā nṛipāṇāṁ Raṇavigrahaḥ
kavīnāṁ cha Surānandaś Chedi-maṇḍala-maṇḍanam.[2]

We learn from the *Chetiya Jātaka*[3] that the metropolis was Sotthivatī-nagara. The *Mahābhārata* gives its Sanskrit name Śuktimatī, or Śukti-sāhvaya.[4] The Great Epic mentions also a river called Śuktimatī which flowed by the capital of *Rājā* Uparichara of the *Chedi-vishaya* (district).[5] Pargiter identifies the stream with the Ken, and places the city of Śuktimatī in the neighbourhood of Banda.[6] Other towns of note were Sahajāti,[7] and Tripurī,[8] the mediæval capital of the *Janapada*.

The Chedi people are mentioned as early as the *Ṛig-Veda*. Their king Kasu Chaidya is praised in a *Dānastuti* (praise of gift) occurring at the end of one hymn.[9] Rapson proposes to identify him with 'Vasu' of the Epics.

The *Chetiya Jātaka* gives a legendary genealogy of Chaidya kings, taking their descent from Mahāsammata

[1] Pargiter (JASB, 1895, 253) places Chedi along the south bank of the Jumna from the Chambal on the north-west as far as Karwi on the south-east, its limits southwards may have been, according to him, the plateau of Malwa and the hills of Bundelkhand.

[2] Attributed to Rājaśekhara in Jahlaṇa's *Sūktimuktāvalī*, Ep Ind. IV. 280 Konow, *Karpūramañjarī*, p. 182.

[3] No. 422.

[4] III. 20. 50, XIV. 83 2, N. L. Dey, *Ind. Ant.*, 1919, p. vii of *Geographical Dictionary*.

[5] I. 63. 35.

[6] JASB, 1895, 255, *Mārkaṇḍeya P.*, p. 359

[7] Aṅguttara, III. 355 (P.T.S.). *Āyasmā Mahāchundo Chetisu viharati Sahajātiyam* Sahajāti lay on the trade route along the river Ganges (*Buddhist India*, p. 103). *Cf.* the legend on a seal-die of terra-cotta found at Bhita, 10 miles from Allahabad (*Arch. Expl. Ind.*, 1909-10, by Marshall, JRAS, 1911, 128 f.)—*Sahijitiye nigamasa*, in letters of about the third century B.C. see also JBORS, XIX, 1933, 293.

[8] Tripurī stood close to the Nerbudda not far from modern Jubbalpore. In the *Haimakosha* it is called Chedinagarī (*JASB*, 1895, 249). The city finds mention in the *Mbh.* III. 253. 10, along with Kośalā, and its people, the Traipuras are referred in VI. 87. 9 together with the Mekalas and the Kurubindas.

[9] VIII. 5. 37-39.

and Māndhāta. Upachara, a King of the line, had five sons who are said to have founded the cities of Hatthipura, Assapura, Sīhapura, Uttarapañchāla and Daddarapura.[1] This monarch is probably identical with Uparichara Vasu, the Paurava king of Chedi, mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*,[2] whose five sons also founded five lines of kings.[3] But epic tradition associates the scions of Vasu's family with the cities of Kauśāmbī, Mahodaya (Kanauj) and Girivraja.[4]

The *Mahābhārata* speaks also of other Chedi kings like Damaghosha, his son Śiśupāla Sunītha and *his* sons Dhṛishṭaketu and Śarabha who reigned about the time of the Bhārata war. But the *Jātaka* and epic accounts of the early kings of Chedi are essentially legendary and, in the absence of more reliable evidence, cannot be accepted as genuine history.

We learn from the *Vedabbha Jātaka*[5] that the road from Kāśi to Chedi was unsafe being infested with roving bands of marauders.

Vaṁśa or Vatsa was the country south of the Ganges[6] of which Kauśāmbī, modern Kosam, on the Jumna, near Allahabad, was the capital.[7] Oldenberg[8] is inclined to identify the Vaṁśas with the Vaśas of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. But the conjecture lacks proof. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśām-

[1] Hatthipura may be identified with Hatthinīpura or Hāstinapura in the Kuru country. Assapura with the city of that name in Aṅga, and Sīhapura with the town of Lāla from which Vijaya went to Ceylon. There was another Simhapura in the Western Punjab (Watters I. 248). Uttarapañchāla is Ahichchhatra in Rohilkhand Daddarapura was apparently in the Himalayan region. (*DPPN*, I. 1054).

[2] I. 63. 1-2.

[3] I. 63. 30.

[4] *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 32. 6 9; *Mahābhārata*, I. 63. 30-33.

[5] No. 48.

[6] Rām. II. 52. 101.

[7] Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, *Priyadarśikā*, lxxvi; the *Bṛihat-Kathā-Śloka-Saṁgraha* (4. 14, cf. 8, 21) explicitly states that Kauśāmbī was on the Kālindī or Jumna. Malalasekera, DPPN, 694. The reference in one text to the position of the city on the Ganges is possibly due to its proximity to the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna in ancient times, or to a copyist's error.

[8] *Buddha*, 393 n.

beya[1] whom Harisvāmin, the commentator, considers to be a native of the town of Kauśāmbi.[2] Epic tradition attributes the foundation of this famous city to a Chedi prince[3]. The origin of the Vatsa people, however, is traced to a king of Kāśi.[4] It is stated in the *Purāṇas* that when the city of Hāstinapura was washed away by the Ganges, Nichakshu, the great-great grandson of Janamejaya, abandoned it, and removed his residence to Kauśāmbī. We have already seen that the Purāṇic tradition about the Bhārata or Kuru origin of the later kings of Kauśāmbī is confirmed by two plays attributed to Bhāsa. Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī, is described in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* and the *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa*[5] as a scion of the *Bhārata-kula.*

The *Purāṇas* give a list of Nichakshu's successors down to Kshemaka, and cite the following genealogical verse: —

> *Brahma-kshatrasya*[6] *yo yonir*
> *vaṁśo devarshi-satkṛitaḥ*
> *Kshemakam prāpya rājānaṁ*
> *saṁsthāṁ prāpsyati vai kalau.*

"The family honoured by gods and sages (or divine sages), from which sprang Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas (or those who combined the Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya status) will verily, on reaching Kshemaka, come to an end (or be interrupted) in the Kali Age."

The criticism that has been offered in this work in regard to the Ikshvāku and Magadhan lists of kings applies with equal force to the Paurava-Bhārata line. Here, too, we find mention of princes (*e.g.*, Arjuna and Abhimanyu) who can hardly be regarded as crowned *nṛipas* or monarchs.

[1] *Śat. Br.*, XII. 2. 2. 13.
[2] See p. 70 *ante*.
[3] *Rām.*, I, 32. 3-6; *Mbh.*, I. 63. 31.
[4] *Harivaṁśa*, 29. 73; *Mbh.*, XII. 49. 80.
[5] *Svapna*, ed. Gaṇapati *Śāstrī*, p. 140; *Pratijñā*, pp. 61, 121.
[6] *Cf. Brahma-Kshatriyāṇāṁ kula* of the inscriptions of the Sena kings who claimed descent from the Lunar Race to which the Bharatas, including the Kurus, belonged.

It is also by no means improbable that, as in the case of the Ikshvākus and the royal houses of Magadha and Avanti, contemporaries have been represented as successors and collaterals described as lineal descendants. There is, moreover, no unanimity in regard to the names of even the immediate predecessors of Udayana, the most famous among the later kings of the family. These facts should be remembered in determining the chronology and order of succession of the Bhārata dynasty of Kauśāmbī. The earliest king of the line about whom we know anything definite is Śatānīka II of the Purāṇic lists. His father's name was Vasudāna according to the *Purāṇas,* and Sahasrānīka according to 'Bhāsa.' Śatānīka himself was also styled Parantapa.[1] He married a princess of Videha as his son is called Vaidehīputra.[2] He is said to have attacked Champā, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana.[3] His son and successor was the famous Udayana, the contemporary of the Buddha and of Pradyota of Avanti and therefore, of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru of Magadha.

The *Bhagga* (Bharga) state of Suṁsumāragiri, 'Crocodile Hill', was a dependency of Vatsa.[4] The *Mahābhārata*[5] and the *Harivaṁśa*[6] testify to the close connection of these two territories and their proximity to the principality of a Nishāda chieftain, while the *Apadāna* seems to associate Bharga with Kārusha.[7] The evidence points to the location of Suṁsumāragiri between the Jumna and the lower valley of the Śon.

[1] *Buddhist India*, p 3.

[2] *Svapna-vāsavadatta*, Act VI, p. 129.

[3] *JASB*, 1914, p. 321.

[4] *Jātaka*, No. 353; *Carmichael Lec.*, 1918, p. 63.

[5] II. 30. 10-11.

Vatsabhūmiñcha Kaunteyo vijigye balavān balāt
Bhargāṇāmadhipañchaiva Nishādādhipatiṁ tathā.

"The mighty son of Kunti (i.e. Bhīmasena) conquered by force the Vatsa country and the lord of the Bhargas and then the chieftain of the Nishādas".

[6] *29. 73. Pratardanasya putrau dvau*
Vatsa-Bhargau babhūvatuḥ.

"Pratardana had two sons, Vatsa and Bharga."

[7] *DPPN*, II. 345.

The Kuru realm was according to the *Mahā-Sutasoma jātaka*[1] three hundred leagues in extent. The reigning dynasty according to the Pali texts belonged to the Yuddhiṭṭhila *gotta, i.e.*, the family of Yudhishṭhira.[2] The capital was Indapatta or Indapattana, *i.e.*, Indraprastha or Indrapat near modern Delhi. It extended over seven leagues.[3] We hear also of another city called Hatthinīpura,[4] doubtless, the Hāstināpura of the epic, and a number of *nigamas* or smaller towns and villages besides the capital, such as Thullakoṭṭhita, Kammāssadamma, Kuṇḍi and Vāraṇāvata.[5].

The *Jātakas* mention the Kuru kings and princes styled Dhanañjaya Koravya,[6] Koravya,[7] and Sutasoma.[8] We cannot, however, vouch for their historical existence in the absence of further evidence.

The Jaina *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* mentions a king named Ishukāra ruling at the town called Ishukāra in the Kuru country.[9] It seems probable that after the removal of the elder branch of the royal family to Kauśāmbī and the decline of the Ābhipratāriṇas, the Kuru realm was parcelled out into small states of which Indapatta and Ishukāra were apparently the most important. "Kings" are mentioned as late as the time of the Buddha[10] when one of them paid a visit to Raṭṭhapāla, son of a Kuru magnate, who had become a disciple of the Śākya Sage.

[1] No. 537.

[2] *Dhūmakāri Jātaka*, No 413; *Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka*, No. 495.

[3] *Jātaka*, Nos. 537, 545.

[4] *The Buddhist Conception of Spirits*, DPPN, II. 1319

[5] The epic (Mbh. V. 31. 19; 72. 15 etc.) has a reference to four villages, *viz.*, Avisthala Vṛikasthala, Mākandī, Vāraṇāvata.

[6] *Kurudhamma Jātaka*, No. 276; *Dhūmakāri Jātaka*, No. 413; *Sambhava Jātaka*, No. 515; *Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka*, No. 545. Dhanañjaya is, as is well-known, a name of Arjuna.

[7] *Dasa Brāhmaṇa Jātaka*, No. 495; *Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka*, No 537.

[8] *Mahā-Sutasoma Jātaka*, *Cf.* the *Mahābhārata*, I. 95. 75 where Sutasoma appears as the name of a son of Bhīma.

[9] S. B. E.,, XLV. 62.

[10] *DPPN*. II. 706 f.

Later on, the little principalities gave place to a *Saṅgha* possibly, a republican confederation.[1]

Pañchāla, as already stated, comprised Rohilkhand and a part of the Central Doāb. The *Mahābhārata*, the *Jātakas* and the *Divyāvadāna*[2] refer to the division of this country into two parts, *viz.*, Uttara or Northern Pañchāla and Dakshiṇa or Southern Pañchāla. The Bhāgīrathī (Ganges) formed the dividing line.[3] According to the Great Epic, Northern Pañchāla had its capital at Ahichchhatra or Chhatravatī, the modern Rāmnagar near Aonlā in the Bareilly District, while Southern Pañchāla had its capital at Kāmpilya, and stretched from the Ganges to the Chambal.[4] A great struggle raged in ancient times between the Kurus and the Pañchālas for the possession of Northern (Uttara) Pañchāla. Sometimes Uttara Pañchāla was included in Kururaṭṭha (-rāshṭra)[5] and had its capital at Hāstinapura,[6] at other times it formed a part of Kampilla-raṭṭha (Kāmpilya-rāshṭra).[7] Sometimes kings of Kāmpilya-rāshṭra held court at Uttara Pañchāla-nagara, at other times kings of Uttara Pañchāla-rāshṭra held court at Kāmpilya.[8]

The history of Pañchāla from the death of Pravāhaṇa Jaivala or Jaivali to the time of Bimbisāra of Magadha is obscure. The only king who may perhaps be referred to this period is Durmukha (Dummukha), the contemporary of Nimi,[9] who is probably to be identified with the penultimate sovereign of Mithilā.[10] In the *Kumbhakāra Jātaka* it is stated that Durmukha's kingdom was styled Uttara Pañchāla-raṭṭha (-rāshṭra); his capital was

[1] *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, 378.
[2] P. 435.
[3] *Mbh.*, I. 138. 70. For divisions in Vedic times see 70 f *ante*.
[4] *Mbh.*, I. 138. 73-74.
[5] *Somanassa Jātaka*, No. 505; *Mahābhārata*, I. 138.
[6] *Divyāvadāna*, p. 435.
[7] *Brahmadatta Jātaka*, No. 323; *Jayaddisa Jātaka*, No. 513 and *Gaṇḍatindu Jātaka*, No. 520.
[8] *Kumbhakāra Jātaka*, No. 408.
[9] *Jātaka*, No. 408.
[10] *Jātaka*, No. 541.

not Ahichchhatra but Kampilla (Kāmpilya)-nagara. He is represented as a contemporary of Karaṇḍu, king of Kaliṅga, Naggaji (Nagnajit), king of Gandhāra, and Nimi, king of Videha. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[1] credits him with extensive conquests and names Bṛihaduktha as his priest: —

"Etaṁ ha vā Aindraṁ Mahābhishekaṁ Bṛihaduktha Ṛishir Durmukhāya Pañchālāya provācha tasmādu Durmukhaḥ Pañchālo Rājā san vidyayā samantaṁ sarvataḥ pṛithivīṁ jayan parīyāya."

"This great anointing of Indra Bṛihaduktha, the seer proclaimed to Durmukha, the Pañchāla. Therefore, Durmukha Pañchāla, being a king, by this knowledge, went round the earth completely, conquering on every side."[2]

A great Pañchāla king named Chulani Brahmadatta is mentioned in the *Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka*,[3] the *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*,[4] the *Svapna-vāsavadattā*[5] and the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[6] In the last-mentioned work he is said to have married the daughters (*kanyāḥ*) of Kuśanābha who were made hump-backed (*kubja*) by the Wind-god. In the *Jātaka*, Kevatta, the minister of Brahmadatta, is said to have formed a plan for making Chulani chief king of all India, and the king himself is represented as having laid siege to Mithilā. In the *Uttar-ādhyayana* Brahmadatta is styled a universal monarch. The story of this king is, however, essentially legendary, and little reliance can be placed on it. The Rāmāyaṇic legend regarding the king is only important as showing the connection of the early Pañchālas with the foundation of the famous city of Kanyākubja (Kanauj) whose name (city of the hump-

[1] VIII. 23.
[2] Keith, *Ṛig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 25.
[3] 546.
[4] S. B. E., XLV. 57-61.
[5] Act V.
[6] I. 32.

backed maiden) is accounted for by the curse to which the story refers.[1]

The *Uttar-ādhyayana Sūtra* mentions a king of Kāmpilya named Sañjaya who gave up his kingly power and adopted the faith of the Jinas.[2] We do not know what happened after Sañjaya renounced his throne. But there is reason to believe that the Pañchālas, like the Videhas, Mallas and Kurus, established a *Saṅgha* form of government of the *Rāja-śabd-opajīvin* type.[3]

Matsya was the extensive territory between the hills near the Chambal and the forests that skirted the **Sarasvatī**, of which the centre was Virāṭa-nagara or Bairāṭ in the modern Jaipur State. The early history of the kingdom has already been related. Its vicissitudes during the period which immediately preceded the reign of Bimbisāra of Magadha are not known.[4] It is not included by the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* among those states which had a *Saṅgha* or non-monarchical form of government. The probability is that the monarchical constitution endured till the loss of its independence. It was probably at one time annexed to the neighbouring kingdom of Chedi. The *Mahābhārata*[5] refers to a king named Sahaja who reigned over the Chedis as well as the Matsyas. It was finally absorbed into the Magadhan Empire. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairāṭ.

A family of Matsyas settled in the Vizagapatam region in mediæval times.[6] We are told that Jayatsena, the lord

[1] Cf. Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, I. 341-42. The point seems to be missed by Ratilal Mehta, *Pre-Buddhist India*, 43 n. The name Kanyākubja or Kānyakubja is already met with in the *Mahābhārata*, I. 175. 3; V. 119. 4. Kānyakubjī occurs in the *Mahābhāshya*, IV. 1. 2. (233), along with Ahichchhatrī. Kaṇṇakujja appears in Pāli texts (DPPN, I. 498).

[2] S.B.E., XLV, 80-82.

[3] *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 378. The Elders of this type of corporations or confederations took the title of *Rājā*. One of these *rājās* was apparently the maternal grandfather of Viśākha Pañchālīputra, a disciple of the Buddha (DPPN, II. 108).

[4] 66 ff *ante*.

[5] V. 74. 16; cf. VI. 47. 67; 52. 9.

[6] Dibbida plates, *Ep. Ind.*, V. 108.

of Utkala, gave to Satyamārtaṇḍa of the Matsya family in marriage his daughter Prabhāvatī, and appointed him to rule over the Oḍḍavādi country. After twenty-three generations came Arjuna who ruled in 1269 A.D.

The **Śūrasena** country had its capital at Mathurā which, like Kauśāmbī, stood on the Jumna. Neither the country nor its metropolis finds any mention in the Vedic literature. But Greek writers refer to the Sourasenoi and their cities Methora (Mathurā) and Cleisobora. Buddhist theologians make complaint about the absence of amenities in Mathurā. They were apparently not much interested in its kettledrums,[1] or in the *śāṭakas* (garments) and *kārshāpaṇas* (coins) about which Patañjali speaks in the *Mahābhāshya*.[2] A highroad connected the city with a place called Verañjā which was linked up with Śrāvastī and the caravan-route that passed from Taxila to Benares through Soreyya, Saṅkassa (Sāṅkāśya), Kaṇṇakujja (Kanyākubja or Kanauj), and Payāga-Patiṭṭhāna (Allahabad).[3]

In the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* the ruling family of Mathurā is styled the **Yadu** or Yādava family. The Yādavas were divided into various sects, namely, the Vītihotras, **Sātvatas** etc.[4] The Sātvatas were subdivided into several branches, *e.g.*, the Daivāvṛidhas, Andhakas, Mahā-bhojas and Vṛishṇis.[5]

Yadu and his tribe are repeatedly mentioned in the *Ṛig-Veda*. He is closely associated with Turvaśa and, in one place, with Druhyu, Anu and Pūru.[6] This association is also implied by the epic and Purāṇic legends which state that Yadu and Turvaśu were the sons of the same parents, and Druhyu, Anu and Pūru were their step-brothers.

We learn from the *Ṛig-veda*[7] that Yadu and Turvaśa

[1] *Gradual Sayings*, II, 78; III. 188.
[2] I. 2. 48 (Kielhorn, I. 19).
[3] *Gradual Sayings*, II, p. 66; DPPN, II. 438, 930, 1311.
[4] *Matsya*, 43-44; *Vāyu*, 94-96.
[5] *Vishṇu*, IV. 13. 1: *Vāyu*, 96. 1-2.
[6] I, 108. 8.
[7] I. 36. 18; VI. 45. 1.

came from a distant land, and the former is brought into very special relation to the **Parsus** or Persians.[1] The Sātvatas or **Satvats** also appear to be mentioned in the Vedic texts. In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[2] the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats and his taking away the horse which they had prepared for an *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, are referred to. The geographical position of Bharata's kingdom is clearly shown by the fact that he made offerings on the Sarasvatī, the Jumna and the Ganges.[3] The Satvats must have been occupying some adjoining region. The epic and Purāṇic tradition which places them in the Mathurā district is thus amply confirmed. At a later time, however, a branch of the Satvats seems to have migrated farther to the south, for in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[4] the Satvats are described as a southern people who lived beyond the Kuru-Pañchāla area, *i.e.*, beyond the river Chambal, and were ruled by **Bhoja** kings. In the Purāṇas also we find that a branch of the Satvats was styled Bhoja[5]:—

"*Bhajina-Bhajamāna-divy- Āndhaka-Devāvṛidha- Mahābhoja-Vṛishṇi-saṁjñaḥ-Sātvatasya putrā babhūvuḥ*...........
Mahābhojastvati dharmātmā tasyānvaye **Bhoja**-*Mārtikāvatā babhūvuḥ*."

[1] VIII 6. 46. Epigraphic evidence points to a close connection between Western Asia and India from about the middle of the second millennium B.C. Ṛig-Vedic Gods like Sūrya (Shurias), Marut (Maruttash), Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa. the Nāsatyas, and even **Daksha** (*dakash*, star, CAH. 1. 553) figure in the records of the Kassites and the Mitanni.

[2] XIII. 5. 4. 21 *Śatānīkaḥ samantāsu medhyaṁ Sātrājito hayam*
ādatta yajñaṁ Kāśīnaṁ Bharataḥ Satvatāmiva.

The *Mbh.*, vii. 66. 7 (*mā sattvāni vijījahi*) seems to miss the import of the Brāhmaṇic gāthā.

[3] *Śat. Br.*, XIII. 5. 4. 11. *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 23; *Mbh.*, VII. 66. 8.
Ashṭāsaptatiṁ Bharato Dauḥshantir Yamunāmanu
Gaṅgāyāṁ Vṛitraghne' badhnāt pañchapañchāśataṁ hayān
Mahākarma (variant *mahadadya*) *Bharatasya na pūrve nāpare janāh*
divyaṁ martya iva hastyābhyāṁ (variant *bāhubhyāṁ*)
nodāpuḥ pañcha mānavā (*iti*).
So śvamedhaśateneshṭvā Yamunāmanu vīryavān
triśatāśvān Sarasvatyāṁ Gaṅgāmanu chatuḥśatān.

[4] VIII. 14. 3.

[5] *Vishṇu* IV. 13. 1-6. In *Mbh.*, VIII. 7. 8. the Sātvata-Bhojas are located in Ānartta (Gujrāṭ).

It is further stated that several southern states, **Māhishmatī**, **Vidarbha** etc., were founded by princes of Yadu lineage.[1] Not only the Bhojas, but the Devāvṛidha branch of the Sātvatas finds mention in the Vedic literature. Babhru Daivāvṛidha[2] is mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[3] as a contemporary of Bhīma, king of Vidarbha, and of Nagnajit, king of Gandhāra. The Andhakas and **Vṛishṇis** are referred to in the *Ashṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini.[4] In the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[5] the Vṛishṇis are described as a *Saṅgha, i.e.*, a republican corporation. The *Mahābhārata*, too, refers to the Vṛishṇis, Andhakas and other associate tribes as a *Saṅgha*,[6] and Vāsudeva, the Vṛishṇi prince, as *Saṅghamukhya* (Elder or Seignior of the confederacy). The name of the Vṛishṇi corporation (*gaṇa*) has also been preserved by a unique coin.[7] It is stated in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* that Kaṁsa, like Peisistratus and others of Greek history, tried to make himself tyrant at Mathurā by overpowering the Yādavas, and that Kṛishṇa-Vāsudeva, a scion of the Vṛishṇi family, killed him. The slaying of Kaṁsa by Kṛishṇa is referred to by Patañjali and the *Ghata Jātaka*.[8] The latter work confirms the Hindu tradition about the association of Kṛishṇa-Vāsudeva's family with Mathurā (Uttara Madhurā).[9]

[1] *Mat*, 43. 10-29; 44. 36, *Vāyu*, 94. 26; 95. 35.

[2] *Vāyu*, 96. 15; *Vishṇu.*, 13 3-5.

[3] VII. 34.

[4] IV. 1. 114; VI. 2. 34.

[5] P. 12.

[6] XII. 81. 25.

[7] Majumdar, *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, p 119, Allan, *CCAI*, pp. clvf, 281.

[8] No. 454.

[9] The city is so called to distinguish it from Madura in South India. The question of the historical existence of Kṛishṇa Vāsudeva has been discussed in my *Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect*, 1st ed, pp. 26-35, 2nd ed., pp. 51 ff and my *Political History of Ancient India*, 1st ed., 1923, p. 312.

Several scholars reject the identification of Kṛishṇa of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* with the historical Kṛishṇa of the *Chhāndogya Upanishad* (III. 17). But we should remember that—

(*a*) Both the Kṛishṇas have the metronymic *Devakīputra*, son of Devakī, which is rare in early times.

The final overthrow of the Vṛishṇis is ascribed to their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas.[1] It is interesting to note that the Vṛishṇis and the Andhakas are branded

(*b*) The teacher of the Upanishadic Kṛishṇa belonged to a family (Āṅgirasa) closely associated with the Bhojas (*Ṛig-Veda*, III, 53. 7), the kindreds of the Epic Kṛishṇa (*Mbh.*, II. 14. 32-34).

(*c*) The Upanishadic Kṛishṇa and his *Guru* Ghora Āṅgirasa were worshippers of *Sūrya* (the Sun-god). We are told in the *Śāntiparva* (335. 19) that the *Sātvata-vidhi* taught by the Epic Kṛishṇa was *prāk-Sūrya-mukha-niḥsṛita*.

(*d*) An Āṅgirasa was the *Guru* of the Upanishadic Kṛishṇa. *Āṅgirasī Śruti* is quoted as "*Śrutīnāmuttamā Śrutiḥ*" by the Epic Kṛishṇa (*Mbh.*, VIII. 69. 85).

(*e*) The Upanishadic Kṛishṇa is taught the worship of the *Sun*, the noblest of all lights (*jyotir-uttamamiti*), high above all darkness (*tamasaspari*). This has its parallel in the *Gītā* (XIII. 18—*jyotishāmapi tajjyotis tamasaḥ param uchyate*).

(*f*) The Upanishadic Kṛishṇa is taught to value, not any material reward (*dakshiṇā*), but rather the virtues of *tapodānam ārjjavam ahiṁsā satyavachanam*. The Gītā also eulogises action performed not for the material fruit thereof. Stress is laid in *Gītā*, XVI. 1-2, on the virtues enumerated in the Upanishads.

The *Purāṇas* no doubt represent Sāndīpani, and not Ghora, as the great teacher of Kṛishṇa. But it has to be remembered that according to the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* (V. 21. 19) Kṛishṇa went to the sage Sāndīpani to learn lessons in the science of arms (*astraśiksha*):

Tataḥ Sāndīpaniṁ Kāśyam Avantīpuravāsinam
astrārthaṁ jagmaturvīrau Baladeva-Janārdanau.

The *Harivaṁśa*, too, informs us (*Vishṇuparva*, 33, 4 ff.) that the residence of Kṛishṇa, who was already a *śrutidhara*, with his Guru Sāndīpani was due to his desire of receiving lessons in the science of the bow (*dhanurvedachikīrshārtham*). The Veda that he learnt from this teacher is not termed *akhila Veda*, or *Trayī*, but simply *sāṅga-Vedam*, the Veda with its auxiliary treatises. The only Veda that is expressly mentioned is the *Dhanurveda* (and not the *Trayī*) together with its four divisions (*chatushpāda*), etc. The compilers of the *Bhāgavata* and *Brahma-Vaivarta Purāṇas* (*Bhāg.*, X. 45. 31 ff.; BV, *Janmakhaṇḍa*, 101-102) introduce details about the study of *all* the *Vedas*, *Upanishads*, treatises on law, philosophy, polity, etc., which are not found in the relevant passage of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, which, according to critics like Bankim Chandra Chaṭṭopādhyāya, represents an earlier and more reliable tradition. Residence with Sāndīpani, therefore, does not conflict with the view that Kṛishṇa accepted the discipleship of Ghora for purposes of religious and philosophical studies (see *EHVS*, 2nd ed., pp. 73-74. Sāndīpani already knew him to be a *Śrutidhara* (versed in the *Śruti* or the *Vedas*; *Harivaṁśa*, *Vishṇuparva*, 33. 6).

Real discrepancies in regard to certain names are sometimes met with in Vedic and epic versions of several legends, *e.g.*, the story of Śunaḥśepa. But even these are not regarded as adequate grounds for doubting the identity of the leading character of the Vedic *Ākhyāna* with that of the corresponding epic tale.

[1] *Mahābhārata*, *Maushala parva*, I. 15-22; 2. 10; *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 122; *Jātaka* Eng. trans. IV. pp. 55-56 V, p. 138. Fausböll, IV. 87f; V. 267.

as *Vrātyas*, *i.e.*, deviators from orthodoxy in the *Droṇa parva* of the *Mahābhārata*.[1] It is a remarkable fact that the Vṛishṇi-Andhakas and other *Vrātya* clans, *e.g.*, the Lichchhavis and Mallas, are found in historical times on the southern and eastern fringe of the "*Dhruvā Madhyamā diś*" occupied by the Kuru-Pañchālas and two other folks. It is not improbable that they represent an earlier swarm of Aryans who were pushed southwards and eastwards by the Pūru-Bharatas, the progenitors of the Kuru Pañchālas. It may be remembered that the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* actually refers to the defeat by Bharata of the Satvats—the progenitors of the Vṛishṇi-Andhakas. And the Great Epic refers to the **exodus of the Yādavas from Mathurā** owing to pressure from the Paurava line of Magadha, and probably also from the Kurus.[2]

The Buddhist texts refer to Avantiputta, king of the Śūrasenas, in the time of Mahā-Kachchāna,[3] one of the chief disciples of Śākyamuni, through whose agency Buddhism gained ground in the Mathurā region. The name of the king suggests relationship with the royal house of Avanti. A king named Kuvinda is mentioned in the *Kāvya-Mīmāṁsā*.[4] The Śūrasenas continued to be a notable people down to the time of Megasthenes. But at that time they must have formed an integral part of the Maurya Empire.

Assaka (*Aśmaka*) was situated on the banks of the Godāvarī.[5] Its capital, Potali, Potana or Podana[6] is possibly to be identified with **Bodhan** in the Nizam's dominions. This accords with its position between Mūlaka (district

[1] 141. 15

[2] *Cf. Bahu-kurucharā Mathurā*. Patañjali. IV 1. 1, *GEI*, p 395 n.

[3] M. 2. 83, DPPN, II. 438.

[4] 3rd ed., p. 50. He prohibited the use of harsh conjunct consonants.

[5] *Sutta Nipāta*, 977.

[6] *Chulla-Kāliṅga Jātaka*, No. 301; D. 2. 235; Law, *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*, 74; *Mbh.*, I. 177. 47. As pointed out by Dr. Sukthankar the older mss. give the name as Potana or Podana and not Paudanya. This agrees with the evidence of the *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* (*Assakānañcha Potanam*) and the *Pariśishṭa parvan* (1. 9?)—*nagare Potanābhidhe*.

round Paiṭhān) and Kaliṅga[1] to which Pāli texts bear witness. In the *Sona-Nanda Jātaka* we find Assaka associated with Avanti. This may suggest that Assaka included at that time Mūlaka and some neighbouring districts and thus its territory approached the southern frontier of Avanti.[2]

In the *Vāyu Purāṇa*[3] Aśmaka and Mūlaka appear as scions of the Ikshvāku family, and the *Mahābhārata* speaks of the royal sage Aśmaka (*Aśmako nāma rājarshiḥ*) as having founded the city of Podana. This probably indicates that the Aśmaka and Mūlaka kingdoms were believed to have been founded by Ikshvāku chiefs, just as Vidarbha and Daṇḍaka were founded by princes of the Yadu (Bhoja) family. The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* mentions Brahmadatta, king of the Assakas, as a contemporary of Sattabhu, king of Kaliṅga, Vessabhu, king of Avanti, Bharata, king of Sovīra, Reṇu, king of Videha, Dhataraṭṭha, king of Aṅga and Dhataraṭṭha, king of Kāsī.[4]

We learn from the *Assaka Jātaka*[5] that at one time the city of Potali was included in the kingdom of Kāsi, and that its prince, Assaka, was presumably a vassal of the Kāsi monarch. The *Chulla Kāliṅga Jātaka* mentions a king of Assaka named Aruṇa and his minister Nandisena, and refers to a victory which they won over the king of Kaliṅga.

Avanti roughly corresponds to the Ujjain region, together with a part of the Narmadā valley from Māndhātā to Maheshwar, and certain adjoining districts. Late Jaina writers include within its boundaries Tumbavana or Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwalior state about

[1] *Sutta Nipāta*, 977; Jātaka No. 301.

[2] *Cf.* Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, pp. 53-54. It appears from the *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* that at one time Avanti extended southwards as far as the Narmadā valley and included the city of Māhishmatī which stood on the banks of the famous river.

[3] 88. 177-178; *Mbh.*, I. 177, 47.

[4] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part II, p. 270. The last-mentioned prince is known to the *Sat. Br*., XIII. 5. 4. 22.

[5] No. 207.

50 miles to the north-west of Eran.[1] The *Janapada* was divided into two parts by the Vindhyas; the northern part drained by the Siprā and other streams had its capital at Ujjain and the southern part washed by the Narmadā had its centre at Māhissatī or Māhishmatī[2] usually identified with the rocky island of Māndhātā.[3]

Buddhist and Jain writers mention several other cities of Avanti, *viz.*, Kuraraghara ("osprey's haunt"), Makkarakaṭa, and Sudarśanapura.[4] The *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* mentions Māhissatī as the capital of the Avantis, and refers to their king Vessabhu. The *Mahābhārata*, however, distinguishes between the kingdoms of Avanti and Māhishmatī, but locates Vinda and Anuvinda of Avanti near the Narmadā.[5]

The *Purāṇas* attribute the foundation of Māhishmatī, Avanti, and Vidarbha to scions of the Yadu family. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* also associates the Satvats and the Bhojas, branches of the Yadu family according to the Purāṇas, with the southern realms.[6]

The *Purāṇas* style the first dynasty of Māhishmatī as Haihaya.[7] This family is already known to the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[8] and figures in the *Shodaśa-rājika* and other

[1] *Iha iva Jambudvīpe' pāg Bhartārdha-vibhūshanam*
Avantiriti deśo 'sti svargadeśīya riddhibhih
tatra Tumbavanamiti vidyate sanniveśanam.
Pariśishṭaparvan, XII. 2-3.

For the position of Tumbavana, see *Ep. Ind.*, XXVI. 115ff.

[2] In J. V. 133 (DPPN, I. 1050) Avanti is placed in Dakshiṇāpatha. This is hardly reconcilable with the view that *only* the *southern* part is meant by the expression *Avanti Dakshiṇāpatha* (Bhandarkar, *Carm Lec.* 54).

[3] Pargiter in *Mark P.* Fleet in JRAS, 1910, 444f There is one difficulty in the way of accepting this identification. Māndhātā lay to the south of the Pāriyātra Mts. (W. Vindhyas), whereas Māhishmatī lay between the Vindhya and the Ṛiksha—to the north of the Vindhya and to the south of the Ṛiksha, according to the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha (*Harivaṁśa*, II. 38. 7-19) For identification with Maheśvara, once the residence of the Holkar family, see *Ind. Ant*, 1875, 346ff. For Māndhātā, see *ibid.*, 1876 53.

[4] Lüders Ins. No. 469; *Gradual Sayings*, V. 31; Law, *Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes*, p. 158; DPPN, I. 193; *Kathākośa*, 18

[5] *Narmadāmabhitaḥ*, *Mbh.*, II. 31. 10.

[6] *Matsya*, 43-44; *Vāyu*, 95-96; *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 14.

[7] *Matsya*, 43, 8-29; *Vāyu*, 94, 5-26.

[8] *Arthaśāstra*, p. 11; *Mbh.*, vii. 68, 6 etc.; *Saundarānanda*, VIII. 45.

episodes of the epic. The Haihayas are said to have overthrown the Nāgas who must have been the aboriginal inhabitants of the Narmadā region.[1] The *Matsya Purāṇa* mentions five branches of the Haihayas, namely Vītihotras, Bhojas, Avantis, Kuṇḍikeras or Tuṇḍikeras and the Tālajaṅghas.[2] When the Vītihotras and Avantis (or the Vītihotras in Avanti) passed away, an *amātya*, minister or governor, named Pulika (Puṇika), is said to have killed his master and anointed his own son Pradyota in the very sight of the *Kshatriyas*.[3] In the fourth century B. C. Avanti formed an integral part of the Magadhan Empire.

The kingdom of **Gandhāra** included within its boundaries the vale of Kaśmīra and the ancient metropolis of Takshaśilā, which lay 2,000 leagues from Benares,[4] but nevertheless attracted students and enquirers from the most distant provinces.

The Purāṇas represent the Gandhāra princes as the descendants of Druhyu.[5] This king and his people are mentioned several times in the *Ṛig-Veda* and apparently belonged to the north-west,[6] a fact that accords with the Purāṇic tradition. Mention has already been made of the early king, Nagnajit, who is reported to have been a contemporary of Nimi, king of Videha, Durmukha, king of Pañchāla, Bhīma, king of Vidarbha,[7] and "Karakaṇḍu," king of Kaliṅga. Jaina writers tell us that those princes

[1] *Cf.* Nāgpur; and *Ind Ant.*, 1884, 85; Bomb. Gaz., I. 2, 313, etc.

[2] 43. 48-49.

[3] We need not infer from this statement that the family of Puṇika sprang from one of the lower orders of society (*e.g.*, cowherds). The point in the Purāṇic account is that the dynastic change was brought about by an *amātya*, a civil functionary (not a *senāpati* like Pushyamitra), and that the army (*Kshatriyas*) looked on, *i.e.*, treated the matter with indifference or silent approval. In the time of Megasthenes soldiers (*kshatriya*, *khattiya-kula*) and councillors (*amātyas*, *amachcha-kula*) were distinct orders of society (*cf.* also Fick, Ch. VI). The Tibetans style Pradyota's father Anantanemi, *Essay on Guṇāḍhya*, p. 173.

[4] *Jātaka*, No. 406; *Telapatta Jātaka*, No. 96; *Susīma Jātaka*, No. 163.

[5] *Matsya*, 48. 6; *Vāyu*, 99.9.

[6] *Vedic Index*, I. 385.

[7] *Kumbhakāra Jātaka*; *Ait. Br.*, VII. 34; *Sat. Br.*, VIII. 1. 4. 10; *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra*. A Nagnajit also appears in the *Mahābhārata* as *the* Gandhārian contemporary of Kṛishṇa V. 48. 75). But the same epic mentions Śakuni as the King of Gandhāra in the time of Kṛishṇa and the Pāṇḍavas.

adopted the faith of the Jainas.[1] As Pārśva (777 B.C.?) was probably the first historical Jina, Nagnajit, if he really became a convert to his doctrines, should have to be placed between 777 B.C. and *cir.* 544 B.C., the date of Pukkusāti, the Gandhārian contemporary of Bimbisāra. The conversion to Jainism, however, does not accord with the story related in the *Jātaka* about his own elevation and that of his confrères to the status of *Pachcheka Buddhas,* or with the interest which the king or his son Svarjit[2] evinced in Brāhmaṇic ritual. It is, however, to be noted that the views of the family in such matters were not treated with respect. The rival claims of different sects need not be taken too seriously. The only fact that emerges is that tradition knew the family to be interested in religious matters and holding views that did not strictly conform to traditional Brāhmaṇism.

In the middle of the sixth century B.C. the throne of Gandhāra was occupied by Pukkusāti (Pushkarasārin), who is said to have sent an embassy and a letter to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, and waged war on Pradyota of Avanti who was defeated.[3] He is also said to have been threatened in his own kingdom by the Pāṇḍavas who occupied a part of the Pañjāb as late as the time of Ptolemy. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C. Gandhāra was conquered by the king of Persia In the Bahistān inscription of Darius, *cir.* 520-518 B.C., the Gandhārians (Gadara) appear among the subject peoples of the Achaemenidan or Achaemenian Empire.[4]

Kamboja is constantly associated with Gandhāra in literature and inscriptions.[5] Like Gandhāra it is included

[1] *SBE.*, XIV 87. [2] *Sat Br.*, VIII 1. 4. 10 *Vedic Index*, I 132

[3] *Buddhist India* p 28 *DPPN*, II 215 *Essay on Gunāḍhya* p 176

[4] See "*Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenian Inscriptions*" by Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderbilt Oriental Series, Vol. VI, *Old Persian Inscriptions,* by Sukumar Sen; *Camb Hist. Ind.*, I. 334. 338.

[5] *Mbh.*, XII. 207 43; *Aṅguttara N.*, P. T. S., I. 213, 4 252, 256, 261; Rock Edict V of Aśoka Quite in keeping with the association with Gandhāra, famous for its good wool (*Rig V* 1 126 7), is the love of Kambojas for blankets (*Kambala*) to which Yāska (11. 2) bears testimony. In the Pāla-Pratihāra age they are also found in Pehoa (Ep. Ind I. 247) and Bengal

in the *Uttarāpatha*, i.e., the Far North of India.[1] It should, therefore, be clearly distinguished from "Kambuja" in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula (*i.e., Cambodia*),[2] and must be located in some part of North-West Indo-Pakistan close to Gandhāra. The *Mahābhārata* connects the Kambojas with a place called Rājapura.[3]—"*Karṇa Rājapuraṁ gatvā Kāmbojā nirjitā-stvayā.*"[4] The association of the Kambojas with the Gandhāras enables us to identify this Rājapura with the territory of that name mentioned by Yuan Chwang[5] which lay to the south or south-east of Punch. The western boundaries of Kamboja must have reached Kāfiristān. Elphinstone found in that district tribes like the 'Caumojee,' 'Camoze,' and 'Camoje' whose names remind us of the Kambojas.[6]

[1] *Cf Mbh*, XII 207 43 *Rājataranginī*, IV 163-165. The chronicle does not place Kamboja to the north of Kashmir It simply places the territory in the Uttarāpatha, and clearly distinguishes it from the land of the Tukhāras, apparently lying further to the north.

[2] For the Hindu colony of "Kambuja" see Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, III pp. 100 ff, B. R Chatterji, *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia*; R C Majumdar, *Kambujadeśa* (Meyer Lectures).

[3] *Mbh.*, VII. 4. 5

[4] "Karṇa *having gone to* (*gatvā*) Rājapura" vanquished the Kambojas The passage can hardly imply that Karṇa marched to Kamboja "*via* Rājapura." It is also futile to suggest that Rājapura had anything to do with Rājagṛiha in Bactria (as is done by a writer in the *Proceedings and Transactions of the Sixth Oriental Conference*, Patna, p. 109) The *Rām.*, I. 6. 22, the *Mbh*, VII. 119 14. 26, and the *Mudrārākshasa*, II, clearly distinguishes Kamboja from Bālhika (Bactria).

[5] Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, Vol I p 284 Cunningham (AGI, 1924, p. 148) identifies Rājapura with the chiefship of Rajaori to the south of Kashmir. The fact that the *Mahābhārata* (II. 27) makes separate mention of Kamboja and Abhisāra (with which the Rajaori region is identified) need not mean that the two were absolutely distinct entities in *all* ages. Does not the Great Epic (II 30. 24-25) distinguish between Suhma and Tāmralipti, and does not the *Daśakumāra-charita* with equal emphasis place Dāmalipta in Suhma? The truth is that Rajaori formed only a *part* of Kamboja which included other areas as well. The ruling family of Rājaurī (Rajaori) in later times were the Khaśas (Stein in JASB, 1899, Extra No. 2. 28).

[6] Elphinstone, *An Account of the Kingdom of Kābul*, Vol. II, pp. 375-377, *Bomb. Gaz.*, I 1. 498 n; *JRAS*, 1843, 140; JASB, 1874, 260 n; Wilson, *Vishṇu P.*, III. 292. With the expression *assānam āyatanam*, 'land of horses' used by Pāli texts in reference to the Kambojas (*DPPN*, I. 526. *cf Mbh*, vi. 90 3) may be compared to the names Aspasioi and Assakenoi given by classical writers to the sturdy tribes living in the Alishang and Swat valleys in the days of Alexander (*Camb. Hist Ind.*, I. 352 n).

Kamboja may have been a home of Brāhmaṇic learning in the later Vedic period. The *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa* actually mentions a teacher named Kāmboja Aupamanyava.[1] The presence of Āryas (Ayyo) in Kamboja is recognised in the *Majjhima Nikāya*.[2] But already in the time of Yāska the Kambojas had come to be regarded as a people distinct from the Aryans of the interior of India, speaking a different dialect.[3] We have further changes in later ages. And in *Bhūridatta Jātaka*[4] the Kambojas are credited with savage (Non-Aryan) customs:

ete hi dhammā anariyarūpā
Kambojakānaṁ vitathā bahunnan ti.[5]
These are your savage customs which I hate,
Such as Kamboja hordes might emulate.[6]

This description of the Kambojas agrees wonderfully with Yuan Chwang's account of Rājapura and the adjoining countries. "From Lampa to Rājapura the inhabitants are coarse and plain in personal appearance, of rude violent dispositions...they do not belong to India proper, but are inferior peoples of frontier (*i.e.*, barbarian) stocks."[7]

The Kambojas in the Epic period had their metropolis probably at Rājapura. Dvārakā, mentioned by Rhys Davids as the capital in the early Buddhist period, was not really situated in this country, though it was connected with it by a road.[8] A real city of the Kambojas was apparently Nandi-nagara mentioned in Lüders' Inscriptions Nos. 176 and 472.

The Vedic texts do not mention any king of Kamboja. But, as has already been pointed out, they refer to a teacher named Kamboja Aupamanyava who was probably

[1] *Vedic Index*, I. 127, 138, *Yāska*, II. 2.
[2] II. 149.
[3] II. 2; JRAS, 1911, 801 f.
[4] No. 543.
[5] *Jātaka*, VI. 208.
[6] Cowell's *Jātaka*, VI. 110.
[7] Watters I. 284; for the Kambojas, see also S. Lévi: "*Pré-Aryen et Pre-Dravidien dans l'Inde,*" JA, 1923.
[8] DPPN, I. 526; *cf.* Law: "*The Buddhist Conception of Spirits,*" pp. 80-83.

connected with this territory. In the *Mahābhārata* the Kambojas are represented as living under a monarchical constitution.[1] The Epic makes mention of their kings Chandravarman and Sudakshiṇa. In later times the monarchy gave place to a *Saṅgha* form of government. The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[2] speaks of the Kambojas as a "*vārtā-śastr-opajīvin*" *Saṅgha*, that is to say, a confederation of agriculturists, herdsmen, traders and **warriors.** Corporations of Kambojas (*Kambojānāñcha ye gaṇāḥ*) are also mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.[3]

SECTION II. AN EPIC ACCOUNT OF THE MAHĀJANAPADAS

An interesting account of the characteristics of the peoples of most of the *Mahājanapadas* described above is to be found in the *Karṇa parva* of the *Mahābhārata*.[4]

The Kurus, Pañchālas, Matsyas, Kosalas, Kāśis, Magadhas, Chedis and Śūrasenas receive praise. Patriots hailing from Aṅga include their country in this list:

Kuravaḥ saha Pañchālāḥ Śālvā Matsyāḥ sa-Naimishāḥ[5]
Kosalāḥ Kāśayo' ṅgāścha Kaliṅgā Māgadhāstathā
Chedayaścha mahābhāgā dharmaṁ jānanti śāśvatam
brāhmaṁ Pañchālāḥ Kauraveyāstu dharmaṁ
Satyaṁ Matsyāḥ Śūrasenāścha yajñam.

"The Kauravas with the Pañchālas, the Śālvas, the Matsyas, the Naimishas, the Kosalas, the Kāśis, the Aṅgas, the Kaliṅgas, the Magadhas, and the Chedis who are all highly blessed, know what the eternal Law of Righteousness is. The Pañchālas observe the Vedic code, the Kauravas the law of right conduct, the Matsyas truth, and the Śūrasenas sacrificial rites."

[1] *Cf.* I. 67. 32; II. 4. 22; V. 165. 1-3; VII. 90. 59. etc.
[2] P. 378.
[3] VII. 89. 38.
[4] *Mahābhārata*, VIII. 40. 29; 45. 14-16; 28; 34; 40.
[5] The Naimishas occupied Nimsār, 20 miles from Sītāpur, on the left bank of the Gumti river (Ayyar, *Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India*, 91).

The Magadhas comprehend hints, the Kosalas understand from what they see,—the Kurus and Pañchālas gather the sense from half-expressed words, while the Śālvas need full instruction.

Iṅgitajñāścha Magadhāḥ prekshitajñāścha Kośalāḥ.
arddhoktāḥ Kuru-Pañchālāḥ Sālvāḥ kṛitsnānuśāsanāḥ.

The Aṅgas had their detractors and come in for a good deal of condemnation along with the Madras and the Gandhāras:

Āturāṇāṁ parityāgaḥ sadāra-suta-vikrayaḥ
Aṅgeshu vartate Karṇa yeshām adhipatir bhavān

"The abandonment of the afflicted and the sale of wives and children are, O Karṇa, prevalent among the Aṅgas whose overlord thou art."

Madrakeshu cha saṁsṛishṭaṁ
śauchaṁ Gāndhārakeshu cha
rāja-yājaka-yājye cha
nashṭaṁ dattaṁ havir bhavet.

"Amongst the Madrakas all acts of friendship are lost as purity among the Gāndhārakas, and the libations poured in a sacrifice in which the king is himself the sacrificer and priest."

The verses quoted above give a fair idea of the attitude, mainly of poets of the western part of the *Madhyadeśa* towards most of the *Mahājanapadas* of Northern India.

Section III The Fall of Kāśi and the Ascendancy of Kosala

Kośalo nāma muditaḥ sphīto janapado mahān
—*Rāmāyaṇa.*

The flourishing period of the sixteen *Mahājanapadas* ended in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. The history of the succeeding age is the story of the absorption of these states into a number of powerful kingdoms, and ultimately into one empire, namely, the empire of Magadha.

Kāśi was probably one of the first to fall. The

Mahāvagga and the *Jātakas* refer to bitter conflicts between this kingdom and its neighbours, specially Kosala. The facts of the struggle are obscure, being wrapped up in legendary matter from which it is impossible to disentangle them. The Kāśis seem to have been successful at first, but the Kosalas were the gainers in the end.

In the *Mahāvagga*[1] and the *Kosambī Jātaka*[2] it is stated that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, robbed Dīghati, king of Kosala, of his realm, and put him to death. In the *Kunāla Jātaka*[3] we are told that Brahmadatta, king of Kāśi, owing to his having an army, seized on the country of Kosala, slew its king, and carried off his chief queen to Benares, and there made her his consort. The *Brahāchatta*[4] and *Sona-Nanda Jātakas*[5] also refer to the victories of Kāśi monarchs over Kosala.

Success, however, did not remain long with the Kāśis.[6] In the *Mahāsīlava Jātaka*[7] king Mahāsīlava of Kāśi is said to have been deprived of his realm by the ruler of Kosala. In the *Ghata*[8] *and Ekarāja Jātakas*[9] Vaṅka and Dabbasena, sovereigns of Kosala, are said to have won for their country a decided preponderance over Kāśi. The final conquest of the latter kingdom was probably the work of Kaṁsa, as the epithet *Barānasiggaho, i.e*, "seizer of Benares" of Kāśi is a standing addition to his name.[10] The interval of time between Kaṁsa's conquest of Kāśi and the rise of Buddhism could not have been very long because the memory of Kāśi as an independent kingdom was still fresh in the minds of the people in the Buddha's time and even later when the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* was composed.

[1] S B E, XVII. 294 99
[2] No 428.
[3] No 536
[4] No. 336
[5] No. 532
[6] No 532.
[7] No. 51.
[8] No. 355
[9] No. 303.
[10] The *Seyya Jātaka*, No. 282, the *Tesakuna Jātaka*, No. 521; *Buddhist India*, p. 25.

In the time of Mahākosala (about the middle of the sixth century B.C.) Kāśi formed an integral part of the Kosalan monarchy. When Mahākosala married his daughter, the lady Kosalādevi, to king Bimbisāra of Magadha, he gave a village of Kāśi producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money.[1]

In the time of Mahākosala's son and successor, Pasenadi or Prasenajit, Kāśi still formed a part of the Kosalan empire. In the *Lohichcha Sutta*[2] Buddha asks a person named Lohichcha the following questions: "Now what think you Lohichcha? Is not king Pasenadi of Kosala in possession of Kāśi and Kosala?" Lohichcha replies, "Yes, that is so, Gotama."[3] We learn from the *Mahāvagga*[4] that a brother of Pasenadi acted as the viceroy of Kāśi.

The *Samyukta Nikāya*[5] speaks of Pasenadi as the head of a group of five *Rājās*. One of these was probably his brother, the viceroy of Kāśi. Among the remaining princes and chiefs we should perhaps include the *rājanya* Pāyāsi of Setavyā mentioned in the *Pāyāsi Suttanta*[6] and the ruler of the Kālāmas of Kesaputta.[7]

Another *Rājā* of the group was apparently the Śākya chief of Kapilavāstu. His political subordination to the Kosalan monarchs appears from several texts.[8] The ruler of Devadaha may have ranked as another notable vassal of Kosala.[9]

[1] *Harita Māta Jātaka*, No. 239, *Vaddhaki Sūkara Jātaka*, No 283

[2] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part I, 288-97.

[3] *Cf. Gradual Sayings*, V. 40. "As far as the Kāsi-Kosalans extend, as far as the rule of Pasenadi, the Kosalan *rājā*, extends, therein Pasenadi, the Kosalan *Rājā*, is reckoned chief."

[4] S.B.E., XVII, 195.

[5] *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids, I., p. 106.

[6] *Cf. Milinda*, IV. 4. 14; the *Vimāna-vatthu* commentary; Law, *Heaven and Hell*, 79, 83. Payāsi occurs as the name of a village in a Sahet Mahet Inscription. It has been identified with a village close to the findspot of the record (Ray, DHNI, I, p. 521).

[7] *Indian Culture*, II, 808; *Aṅguttara*, I, 188.

[8] See *Supra*, p. 99.

[9] Kapilavastu, Devadaha and Koliya are sometimes mentioned as three

It was probably during the reign of Mahākosala, that Bimbisāra was anointed king of Magadha. With the coronation of this famous ruler ends the period with which this part of the work deals.

SECTION IV. KINGSHIP.

We have endeavoured to give in outline the story of the political vicissitudes through which Northern India and a considerable portion of the Deccan passed from the accession of Parikshit to the coronation of Bimbisāra. We shall now attempt a brief survey of some of the institutions of the age without which no political history is complete. We have seen that during the major part of the period under review the prevailing form of government was monarchical. The later Vedic texts and auxiliary treatises give us a few details about the rank and power of the rulers in the different parts of India, their social status, the methods of their selection and consecration, the chief members of their household, the civil and military services, the limitations of royal authority and popular participation in affairs of the state. Even when all scraps of information are pieced together, the picture is dim. The facts gleaned from Vedic sources which alone can, with confidence, be referred to the period before 500 B.C. have to be elucidated or supplemented by post-Vedic data embodying traditions about the heroic age that preceded the rise and growth of the Magadhan Empire.

The various **kinds of rulership** prevalent in different parts of India are thus described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*.[1]

"Etasyāṁ Prāchyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Prāchyānāṁ

distinct states (*DPPN*, I, 1021). The subordination of the Śakyas to the King of Kosala necessarily implies the latter's control over Devadaha which was in part, at any rate, a Śākyan city.

[1] VIII. 14.

rājānaḥ Sāmrājyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Samrāṭ ityenān-abhishiktān āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Dakshiṇāyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Satvatāṁ Rājāno Bhaujyā iva te'bhishichyante Bhoj-jetyenān-abhishiktān-āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Pratīchyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Nīchyānāṁ Rājāno ye' pāchyānāṁ Svārājyāyaiva te' bhishichyante Svarāṭ-ityenān-abhishiktān āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ Udīchyāṁ diśi ye ke cha pareṇa Himavantaṁ Janapadā Uttara-Kurava Uttara-Madrā iti Vairājyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Virāṭ-ityenān-abhishiktān āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu.

Etasyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ Madhyamāyaṁ pratishṭhāyāṁ diśi ye ke cha Kuru-Pañchālānāṁ Rājānaḥ sa Vaś-Ośīnarāṇāṁ Rājyāyaiva te'bhishichyante Rāj-etyenān-abhishiktān āchakshata etāmeva Devānāṁ vihitimanu."

"In this eastern quarter, whatever kings there are of the eastern peoples they are anointed for overlordship (*Sāmrājya*); 'O Overlord' they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In the southern quarter whatever kings there are of the Satvats, they are anointed for paramount rule (*Bhaujya*); 'O Paramount Ruler' they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this western quarter, whatever kings there are of the southern and western peoples, they are anointed for self-rule (*Svārājya*); 'O Self-Ruler' they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this northern quarter, the lands of the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras, beyond the Himavat, their (kings?) are anointed for sovereignty (*Vairājya*); 'O Sovereign' they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods. In this firm middle established quarter, whatever kings there are of the Kuru-Pañchālas with the Vaśas and Uśīnaras, they are anointed for kingship; 'king' they style them when anointed in accordance with the action of the gods."[1]

[1] *Ṛig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*, translated by Keith, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 25.

Several scholars assert that *Vairājya* means a kingless state. But in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[1] a king consecrated with Indra's great unction is called *Virāṭ* and worthy of *Vairājya*. When a king consecrated with the *Punarabhisheka* (renewed anointment) ascends his *Āsandī* or throne, he prays for attaining *Vairājya* as well as other kinds of royal dignity. Sāyaṇa takes the word *Vairājyam* to mean pre-eminence among kings, *itarebhyo bhūpatibhyo vaiśishṭyam*. This is virtually the sense of the word that Dr. Keith accepts in his translation.

The *Śukranīti*,[2] too, understands *Virāṭ* to denote a superior kind of monarch. In the *Mahābhārata* Kṛishṇa is lauded as *Samrāṭ Virāṭ Svarāṭ* and *Sura-rāja*.[3] If the Uttara-Kurus and the Uttara-Madras are to be regarded as republican, it is not because of the use of the term *Vairājya*, but because in their case it is not the *rājan* but the *janapada* which is said to be anointed for sovereignty. It should, however, be remembered that already in the Brāhmaṇa period Uttara-Kuru has become a *devakshetra* which the arms of a mortal could not reach.[4]

It is not easy to decide whether all the terms *Sāmrājya, Bhaujya, Svārājya, Vairājya* and *Rājya* referred to essentially different forms of royal authority in the Brāhmaṇic period. But two terms at least, namely, *Sāmrājya* and *Rājya* are clearly distinguished from each other by the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[5]

Rājā vai Rajasūyeneshṭvā bhavati, Samrāḍ Vājapeyenāvaraṁ hi Rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyam. Kāmayeta vai Rājā Samrāḍ bhavitum avaraṁ hi rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyam. Na

[1] VIII. 17

[2] B. K. Sarkar's Translation, p. 24. Kauṭilya (VIII. 2), however, takes *Vairājya* to mean a system of government which comes into existence by forcible seizure of a country from the legitimate ruler for purposes of exploitation.

[3] XII. 43. 11; *cf.* 68. 54.

[4] *Ait. Br.* viii. 23. The existence of *Gaṇas* and of *Gaṇajyeshṭhas* are hinted at *Rig. V.* I. 23, 8; II. 23. 1; X. 34. 12; 112. 9; *Śat. Br.* XIII. 2. 8. 4. etc.

[5] V. 1. 1. 12-13; *cf. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, XV. 1. 1, 2

Samrāṭ kāmayeta Rājā bhavitum avaraṃ hi rājyaṁ paraṁ Sāmrājyam.

"By offering the *Rājasūya* he becomes *Rājā* and by the *Vājapeya* he becomes *Samrāj*, and the office of *Rājan* is the lower and that of *Samrāj*, the higher; a *Rājan* might indeed wish to become *Samrāj*, for the office of *Rājan* is the lower and that of *Samrāj* the higher; but the *Samrāj* would not wish to become a *Rājā* for the office of *Rājan* is the lower, and that of *Samrāj* the higher."

In the *Rig-Veda*,[1] and later on in the *Purāṇas*, *Bhoja* appears as a proper name. But the Brāhmaṇas regard it as a royal designation, applicable to the consecrated monarchs of the southern region[2] The word Cæsar furnishes a parallel Originally the name of a Roman dictator and of members of his family, it is used, in later ages, as a title by Roman and German Emperors. As to *Svārājya* it is sometimes taken to mean uncontrolled dominion, and is opposed to *Rājya*.[3]

The king was usually, though not always, a Kshatriya. The Brāhmaṇas were considered to be unsuited for kingship. Thus we read in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*—"To the king (*Rājan*) doubtless belongs the *Rājasūya*; for by offering the *Rājasūya* he becomes king, and unsuited for kingship is the Brāhmaṇa.[4]

Rājña eva rājasūyam. Rājā vai rājasūyeneshṭvā bhavati na vai Brāhmaṇo rājyāyālam avaraṁ vai rājasūyam paraṁ Vājapeyam.

A Brāhmaṇa king is, however, contemplated in a passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmana*.[5] We have references

[1] III 53. 7.

[2] 'Bhoja' may have reference to the king or chieftain as *ruler*, *protector* or *devourer* of his people (*Viśāmattā*) It appears as an official designation in several inscriptions of Southern India (*Ind Ant* 1876, 177; 1877, 25-28). In *Mbh*. I. 84. 22, it is applied to a ruler and his family who are deprived of many of the attributes of sovereignty (*arājā Bhojaśabdaṁ tvaṁ tatra prāpsyasi sānvayaḥ*).

[3] *Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā*, XIV. 5, *Maitrāyanī Saṁhitā*, 1. 11, 5, etc., *Vedic Index*, II. 221.

[4] V. I. I. 12; *SBE*, XLI; Eggeling, *Śat. Br.*, Part III, p. 4.

[5] VIII. 23 (story of Atyarāti's offer to Vāsishtha Sātyahavya)

to Śūdra, Āyogava and even non-Aryan kings in other Vedic texts. King Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa is branded a Śūdra in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*.[1] King Marutta Āvikshita is styled "*Āyogava*" in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[2] *Āyogava* denotes, in legal codes, a member of a mixed caste, a descendant of a Śūdra by a Vaiśya wife.[3] Nishāda *sthapatis* (kings or chieftains) figure in a *Śrauta sūtra* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa* it is stated that even an *anārya* "obtains," *prāpnoti*, kings.[4] This points either to non-Aryan kings or to the admission of *anāryas* into the dominions of Aryan rulers. The *Jātakas* and the Great Epic refer to kings of various castes including Brāhmaṇas.[5]

Kingship was sometimes **hereditary,** as is indeed shown by several cases where the descent can be traced. Mention may be made in this connection of the Pārikshitas and the kings of Janaka's line; hereditary kingship is also suggested by the expression *Daśapurushaṁrājya*—a kingdom of ten generations—occurring in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[6] But elective monarchy was not unknown.[7] The selection was made sometimes by the people and occasionally by the ministers. The choice was ordinarily limited to the members of the royal family only, as is

[1] IV. 2 1-5 Apparently Śūdra kings were not unknown in the age.

[2] XIII 5. 4. 6.

[3] *Manu-Saṁhitā*, X. 12.

[4] *Vedic Index*, I. 454; *Rām*. II. 50. 32; 84. 1. *Jaim Up. Br*., 1. 4. 5.

[5] *Cf Jātakas*, 73, 432, *Mbh* , i 100. 49f; 138. 70

[6] XII. 9. 3. 1-3, *cf*. also the reference to the birth of an heir to the throne (*Ait. Br* VIII. 9) and to the king as *Rājapitā*, VIII. 17.

[7] Reference may be made in this connection to the passages of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (*e.g.*, VIII. 12) describing the choice and consecration of divine rulers (Ghoshal, *A History of Hindu Political Theories*, 1927, p 26), and notices of royal election in post-Vedic texts looking back to an early period. *e.g.*, *Mbh*., I. 94. 49—*rājatve taṁ prajāḥ sarvā dharmajña iti vavrire*. The expression king-maker (*rāja-kartṛi*, *Ait. Br*., VIII. 17; *Śat Br*., III. 4. 1. 7) points to the important part played by officials including headmen of villages in the choice of the ruler. Both in the Vedic texts (*Ait. Br*., VIII. 12) and the epic emphasis is laid on the possession of moral qualities. The leader on whom the choice falls is *ojishṭha*, *balishṭha*, *sahishṭha*, *sattamaḥ*, *pārayishnutama*, *dharmajña*. In the fourth century B. C. physical beauty carried the palm in one territory (Kathaia in the Punjab according to Onesikritos)

shown by the legend in Yāska[1] of the Kuru brothers Devāpi and Saṁtanu, and the story in the *Saṁvara Jātaka*[2] of the Kāśi princes Uposatha and Saṁvara. In the *Jātaka* the councillors ask a reigning king, "When you are dead, my lord, to whom shall we give the white umbrella?" "Friends," said the monarch, "all my sons have a right to the white umbrella. But you may give it to him that pleases your mind."

At times the **popular choice** fell on persons who did not belong to the ruling dynasty. Such may have been the case when the Sriñjayas expelled their hereditary ruler together with the *Sthapati*.[3] Clear instances of popular preference for individuals outside the royal family are furnished by the *Jātakas*. The *Pādañjali Jātaka*,[4] for instance, tells us that when a certain king of Benares died, his son, Pādañjali by name, an idle lazy loafer, was set aside, and the minister in charge of things spiritual and temporal was raised to the throne. The *Sachchaṁkira Jātaka*,[5] relates a story how nobles, Brāhmaṇas and all classes slew their king and anointed a private citizen. Sometimes the candidate comes from a place outside the realm. The *Darīmukha*[6] and *Sonaka Jātakas*[7] tell us how on failure of heir at Benares a prince of Magadha was elected king.

The monarch during the Brāhmaṇa period was usually allowed to have **four queens**, *viz.*, the *Mahishī*, the *Parivṛiktī*, the *Vāvātā* and the *Pālāgalī*. The *Mahishī*, was the chief wife, being the first one married according to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[8] The *Parivṛiktī* was the neglected or discarded wife, probably one that had no son. The *Vāvātā* is the favourite, while the *Pālāgalī* was the daughter

[1] *Nirukta*, II 10, *Ved Ind.*, II, 211.
[2] No. 462
[3] *Sat Br.*, XII, 9 3 1 ff.
[4] No. 247
[5] No. 73.
[6] No 378, *cf* No. 401.
[7] No 529.
[8] VI. 5. 3. 1. *Ved Ind.*, I. 478.

of the last of the court officials.[1] The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*,[2] however, refers to the "hundred" wives of king Hariśchandra. In the *Jātaka* period several kings kept a bigger harem. We are told in the *Kusa Jātaka*[3] that king Okkāko (Ikshvāku) had sixteen thousand ladies in his harem among whom Sīlavatī was the chief (*aggamahishī*). The king of Benares according to the *Dasaratha Jātaka*,[4] had the same number of wives. In the *Suruchi Jātaka*,[5] a king of Mithilā says, "Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithilā covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen thousand women at the least." Sixteen thousand appears to have been a stock phrase. The number is evidently exaggerated. But it indicates that the kings of the *Jātaka* period were extreme polygamists who frequently exceeded the Brāhmaṇic number of four or even a hundred queens.

The king was consecrated after his succession or election with an elaborate ritual which is described in several *Brāhmaṇas*, and for which the appropriate formulas (*mantras*) are given in the Vedic *Saṁhitās*. Those who aided in the consecration of the king were called *Rājakartṛi* or *Rājakṛit*, *i.e.*, "king-maker." In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[6] the persons meant and specified are the *Sūta* (minstrel, chronicler or charioteer), and the *Grāmaṇī*, leader of the host or of the village.[7] Prof. Rādhākumud Mookerji observes:[8] "It is apparent from the lists of persons aiding in the royal coronation that both official and non-official or popular elements were represented in the function." The principal ceremonies or sacrifices of royal inauguration

[1] Weber and Pischel in *Vedic Index*, 1, 478.

[2] VII. 13.

[3] No. 531.

[4] No. 461. The *Rāmāyaṇa* (II. 34. 13) allows this king only 750 ladies besides the chief consorts.

[5] No. 482.

[6] III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 18.

[7] The post of *Grāmaṇī* seems to have been ordinarily held by a Vaiśya (*Vedic Index*, I. 247; II. 334; *Camb. Hist.*, 131; *Śat. Br.*, V. 3. 1. 6).

[8] *The Fundamental Unity of India*, p. 83.

were the *Vājapeya*, the *Rājasūya*, the *Punar-abhisheka* and the *Aindra Mahābhisheka*.

The *Vājapeya* (lit. "the drink of strength") bestowed on the performer a superior kind of kingship called "*Sāmrājya*," while the *Rājasūya* or royal inaguration merely conferred the ordinary monarchical dignity.[1] The *Punar-abhisheka*, or renewed consecration, made the king elect eligible for all sorts of royal dignity, *viz*., *Rājya*, *Sāmrājya*, *Bhaujya*, *Svārājya*, *Vairājya*, *Pārameshṭhya*, *Māhārājya*, *Ādhipatya*, *Svāvaśya* and *Ātishṭhatva*.[2] The object of the *Aindra Mahābhisheka* (the great anointing of the king of the celestials) is thus described:

"*Sa ya ichchhed evaṁvit Kshatriyam ayaṁ sarvā jitīr-jayetāyaṁ sarvāṁllokān vindetāyaṁ sarveshāṁ Rājñām Śraishṭhyaṁ, Atishṭhām, Paramatām gachchheta, Sam-rājyaṁ, Bhaujyaṁ, Svārājyaṁ, Vairājyaṁ, Pārameshṭhyaṁ. Rājyaṁ, Māhārājyaṁ Ādhipatyaṁ, ayaṁ samantaparyāyī syāt Sārvabhaumaḥ sārvāyusha ā'ntād ā parārddhāt pṛithi-vyai samudraparyantāyā* **Ekarāt** *iti tametena Aindreṇa Mahābhishekeṇa kshatriyaṁ śāpayitvā'bhishiñchet*.[3]

"If he who knows thus should desire of a *kshatriya*, 'May he win all victories, find all the worlds, attain the superiority, pre-eminence and supremacy over all kings and overlordship, paramount rule, self-rule, sovereignty, supreme authority, kingship, great kingship and suzerainty, may he be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler;' he should anoint him with the great anointing of Indra, after adjuring him".[4]

[1] *Rājya*, *cf*. *Sat*. *Br*, V. 1 1, 12-13; some texts while agreeing that the *Vājapeya* is a *Samrāṭsava* says that the *Rājasūya* is a *Varuṇa-sava*, consecrated to the universal sway wielded by Varuṇa. *Tait*. *Saṁ* (V. 6. 2 1) and *Br* (II. 7. 6. 1); *Sat*. *Br*, V. 4. 3. 2; Keith, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, 340, *Mahābhārata*, Bk II. 12. 11-13, etc

[2] *Ait*. *Br*., VIII. 6 For the meaning of these terms see Keith's translation quoted below. Keith's rendering of some of the expressions, *e.g*. *Bhaujya* and *Vairājya*, is, however, hardly satisfactory

[3] *Ait*. *Br*., VIII. 15.

[4] Keith, *HOS*, Vol. 25

The **Vājapeya** rites[1] include a race of 17 chariots, in which the sacrificer is allowed to carry off the palm, and from which, according to Eggeling, the ceremony perhaps derives its name. Professor Hillebrandt would claim for this feature of the sacrifice the character of a relic of an old national festival, a kind of Indian Olympic games. After the chariot race the next interesting item is the mounting of a pole, having a wheaten ring or wheel[2] on the top, by the sacrificer and his wife, from which homage is made to the mother earth. The *Śatapatha Brāhmana* says, "Truly he who gains a seat in the air gains a seat above others."[3] The royal sacrificer having descended from the pole, is offered a throne-seat with a goatskin spread thereon and addressed by the *Adhvaryu* (priest) in the following words: "Thou art the ruler, the ruling lord (*yantṛi, yamana*)—thou art firm and steadfast (*dhruva, dharuṇa*)—(here I seat) thee for the tilling, for peaceful dwelling (*kshema*), for wealth (*rayi*), for prosperity (*posha*), *i.e.*, for the welfare of the people, the common weal."[4]

The **Rājasūya** consisted of a long succession of sacrificial performances which began on the first day of *Phālguna* and spread over a period of upwards of two years.[5] The rite is described at great length in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.*[6] Besides much mere priestly elaboration, the ritual contains traces of popular ceremonial. The popular features are chiefly these:—

(1) The *Ratninām havīṁshi*[7] or presents to the divinities of the bejewelled ones (or those possessed of the jewel offering), *viz.*, the chief queen and court officials;

[1] *Śat. Br.*, V. 1. 1. 5 ff; *S.B.E.*, xli; *Vedic Index*, II. 281; Keith, *Black-yajus*, cviii-cxi; RPVU, 339f.

[2] *Gaudhūmaṁ cha shālam*, "a wheaten headpiece (Eggeling)" "a wheel-shade garland of meal" (S. B. E., xli. 31; Keith, RPVU, 339; *Śat. Br.*, V. 2. 1. 6).

[3] *Śat. Br.*, V. 2, 1. 22.

[4] *Śat. Br.*, V. 2. I. 25; *The Fundamental Unity of India*, p. 80.

[5] Keith, *Black Yajus*, pp. cxi-cxiii, *RPVU*, 341; *Vedic Index*, II. 219. SBE., xli, p. xxvi.

[6] V. 2. 3. 9. (*et seq.*) S.B.E., xli, 42-115.

[7] *Śat. Br.*, V. 3. 1. M. Louis Renou says—"les offrandes ne sont pas faites aux *ratnin* mais aux divinités dans les maisons de chaque *ratnin*."

(2) The *Abhishechanīya*[1] or besprinkling ceremony;

(3) The *dig vyāsthāpana*[2] or the king's symbolical walking towards the various quarters as an indication of his universal rule;

(4) Treading upon a tiger skin,[3] thus gaining the strength and the pre-eminence of the tiger;

(5) Narration by the *hotṛi* priest of the story (*akhyāna*) of *Śunaḥśepa*.[4]

(6) A mimic cow raid against a relative[5]; or a sham fight with a member of the ruling aristocracy (*rājanya*);[6]

(7) Enthronement;[7]

(8) A game of dice in which the king is made to be the victor;[8]

The recipients of the sacrificial honours called "*Ratnināṁ havīṁshi*" were the divinities in the houses of the **Ratnins,** *i.e.*, of the chief members of the royal household and of the king's civil and military service, *viz.*—

1. The *Senānī* (Commander of the army).[9]
2. The *Purohita* (Royal Chaplain).
3. The *Mahishī* (Chief Queen).
4. The *Sūta* (Charioteer and Bard).[10]
5. The *Grāmaṇī* (Leader of the Host or Village Headman).[11]
6. The *Kshattṛi* (Chamberlain)—forerunner of the *Antarvaṁśika* or Superintendent of the Seraglio of later times.[12]

[1] *Śat. Br.*, V. 3. 3·4.

[2] *Śat. Br.*, V. 4. 1. 3; Keith, *Black Yajus, op. cit.*

[3] *Śat. Br.*, V. 4. 1. 11.

[4] *Ait. Br.*, vii, 13 ff, Keith, *RPVU*, 341n.

[5] *RPVU*, 342; *cf. Śat. Br.*, V. 4. 3. 3 *et seq*

[6] *Cf. Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, 1. 8. 15 with commentary; *Vedic Index*, II 219. SBE, xli, 100, n. 1.

[7] *Śat Br.*, V. 4. 4. 1.

[8] *Śat Br* V 4. 4. 6; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, etc., p. 342.

[9] *Cf. Senāpati* in *Ait. Br.*, viii. 23.

[10] The importance of this office is shown by the cases of Sumantra and of Sañjaya who is called a *Mahāmātra* (*Mbh.* XV. 16. 4).

[11] *Cf. the Adhikṛitas* appointed for grāmas or villages by the paramount ruler (*Samrāṭ*) mentioned in the *Praśna Upanishad* (III. 4).

[12] Vidura was the *Kshattri* (*Mbh.*, I. 200, 17; II. 66. 1, etc.) at the Kura Court. For the views of different commentators see *Vedic Index*, I. 201.

7. The *Saṁgrahītṛi* (Treasurer)—forerunner of the *Sannidhātṛi of the Arthaśāstra.*

8. The *Bhāgadugha* (Collector of the Royal Share, *i.e.*, Taxes)—forerunner of the *Samāhartṛi.*

9. The *Akshāvāpa* (Keeper of the Dice).[1]

10. The *Go-vikartana* (lit. Cutter-up of Cattle, *i.e.*, the King's Companion in the Chase).

11. The *Pālāgala* (Courier)—forerunner of the *Dūta* (*Śāsanahara, etc.*).[2]

The most essential part of the *Rājasūya* was the **Abhisheka** or besprinkling. It began with offerings to the deities Savitā Satyaprasava, Agni Gṛihapati, Soma Vanaspati, Bṛihaspati Vāk, Indra Jyeshṭha, Rudra Paśupati, Mitra Satya and Varuṇa Dharmapati. The consecration water (*Abhishechanīyā Āpaḥ*) was made up of seventeen kinds of liquid including the water from the river Sarasvatī, sea-water, and water from a whirlpool, a pond, a well and dew. The sprinkling was performed by a Brāhmaṇa priest, kinsman or brother of the king-elect, a friendly *Rājanaya* and a *Vaiśya.*

The two most important kinds of *Abhisheka* were the *Punar-abhisheka* and the *Aindra Mahābhisheka.*

The **Punar-abhisheka** or Renewed Anointment is described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.*[3] It was intended for Kshatriya conquering monarchs. The first interesting part of the ceremony was the king's ascent to the throne or *Āsandī* which was made of *udumbara* wood with the

[1] *Cf.* the position of Kaṅka (Yudhiṣṭhira) at the Matsya Court.

[2] Curiously enough, this list of *the ratnins* does not include the *Sthapati*, probably a local ruler, vassal chief, or governor who is, however, mentioned in *Śat. Br.*, V. 4. 4. 17, in connection with the concluding ceremonies of the *rājasūya.* The sacrificial sword (*sphya*) given by the priest to the king is passed on successively to the king's brother, the *sūta* or the *sthapati*, the *grāmaṇī* and finally to a tribesman (*sajāta*). The post of *sthapati,* was held by *Uparikas* or governors of *Bhuktis* (provinces) in the Gupta period (Fleet, CII, p. 120). Slightly different lists of *ratnins* are found in the *Taittirīya* texts. A group of eight *vīras* finds mention in the *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I. 131). In *Śat. Br.*, XIII. 5. 4. 6. we have reference to the *Pariveshṭṛi*, the *Kshattṛi* and the *Sabhāsads* in connection with a performance of the horse-sacrifice.

[3] VIII. 5-11

exception of the interwoven part (*vivayana*) which consisted of *muñja* grass. Then came the besprinkling. Among other things the priest said: "Do thou become here the overking of kings; the great of the great people, the supreme ruler of the people (or the peasantry)."[1] *Rājñāṁ tvam Adhirāja bhaveha; Mahāntam tvā mahīnāṁ Samrājaṁ charshaṇīnām.*"[2] The king was next required to get down from the throne and make obeisance to the holy power (Brahman); "*Brahmaṇa eva tat Kshatraṁ vaśam eti tad yatra vai Brahmaṇaḥ Kshatraṁ vaśam eti tad rāshṭraṁ samṛiddhaṁ tad vīravadāhāsmin vīro jāyate,*[3] "verily thus the lordly power (*Kshatra*) falls under the influence of the holy power (*Brahman*). When the lordly power falls under the influence of the holy power, that kingdom is prosperous, rich in heroes; in it a hero or heir (*vīra*) is born."[4] Here there is provision for the prevention of royal absolutism.

Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, was evidently consecrated with the *Punar-abhisheka*.[5]

The **Aindra Mahābhisheka**[6] or Indra's great unction consisted of five important ceremonies. In the first place, an **Oath** is administered by the priest to the king-elect: "From the night of thy birth to that of thy death for the space between these two, thy sacrifice and thy gifts, thy place, thy good deeds, thy life and thine offspring let me take, if thou play me false."[7] Next follows the *Ārohaṇa* or enthronement. When the king is seated on the throne we have the *Utkrośana*[8] or proclamation. The king-makers should say "The *Kshatriya*, if not proclaimed, cannot show

[1] Keith, HOS 25 (slightly emended).
[2] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 7.
[3] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 9.
[4] Keith.
[5] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 11. A second coronation of the Ceylonese king Devānaṁpiya Tissa is referred to by the chronicles (Geiger's trans. of the *Mahāvaṁsa*, pp. xxxii).
[6] *Ait. Br.*, viii. 12-23.
[7] Keith, *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 15.
[8] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 17.

his strength, let us proclaim him." "Be it so" (the people reply). Him the king-makers proclaim saying:

"Him do ye proclaim, O men (*janāḥ*) as king and father of kings . . . The sovereign lord of all beings (*Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati*) hath been born, the eater of the folk (*Viśāmattā*) hath been born, the destroyer of enemies (*Amitrāṇāṁ hantā*) hath been born, the protector of the Brāhmaṇas (*Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā*) hath been born, the guardian of the law (*Dharmasya goptā*) hath been born."

Here we have the important attributes of kingship. In the words *Viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati* (supereme lord of all beings) we have a reference to the king's sovereignty and *imperium*. The expression *Viśāmattā*, devourer of the folk, alludes to his power of taxation. As *Amitrāṇāṃ hantā* he exercises supreme command to weed out enemies. The epithet *Brāhmaṇānāṁ goptā* gives expression to his special relations with the hierarchy, while the style *Dharmasya goptā* points to his duties in connection with the preservation of the laws and their proper administration for the promotion of the common weal (*yoga-kshema*).

When the king has been proclaimed there is an address with the formula, *abhimantraṇa*.[1]

> *Varuṇa the Wise One*
> *Hath set him down, preserving order,*
> *. . . . . for kingship . . . . . .*

Then comes the anointment (*abhishechana*).

The following kings are said to have been consecrated with the *Aindra Mahābhisheka;* Janamejaya Pārikshita, Śāryāta Mānava, Śatānīka Sātrājita, Āmbāshṭhya, Yudhāṁśraushṭi Augrasainya, Viśvakarmā Bhauvana, Sudās Paijavana, Marutta Āvikshita, Aṅga Vairochana and Bharata Dauḥshyanti.[2] The first mentioned king, and probably the third, fourth, fifth and ninth also, belonged to the post-Parikshit period.[3] Durmukha Pāñchāla and Atyarāti

[1] *Ibid.*, VIII. 18.

[2] *Ibid.*, VIII. 21-23.

[3] Śatānīka defeated Dhṛitarāshṭra of Kāsi who, according to the *Mahāgovinda Suttanta* was a contemporary of Sattabhu of Kaliṅga and of Brahma

Jānantapi were informed of the efficacy of the rite. The first made good use of the advice. But the latter who neglected his priest, and wanted to conquer the Uttara-Kurus, whom "no mortal man could vanquish," perished at the hands of a king of the Śibis.

Closely connected with the *Aindra mahābhisheka* was another important ceremonial called the **Aśvamedha** or horse-sacrifice. All the kings who were, according to the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, actually consecrated with Indra's great function are represented as "going round the earth completely, conquering on every side, and offering the horse in sacrifice" (*samantaṁ sarvataḥ pṛithivīṁ jayan parīyāyāśvena cha medhyeneje*). To the list of kings and princes who performed the famous rite the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[1] adds the names of the Pārikshitas (or Pārikshitīyas) Bhīmasena, Ugrasena and Śrutasena; the Kosalan king (*Kauśalya-rāja*) Para Āṭṇāra Hairaṇyanābha; the Aikshvāka king Purukutsa Daurgaha; the Pāñchāla kings Kraivya, the superman of the Krivis (*Krivīṇām atipurusha*) and Śona Sātrāsāha; the Matsya king Dhvasan Dvaitavana, and the Śvikna king Ṛishabha Yājñātura. The *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* says that a paramount king (*Sārvabhauma Rājā*) may perform the *Aśvamedha*.[2] The Aśva or steed for a year

datta of Assaka. As the Deccan kingdoms are not referred to in pre-Pārikshita works, it is probable that Śatānīka and his contemporaries flourished after Parikshit. Ambāshṭhya and Yudhāmśraushṭi were contemporaries of Parvata and Nārada who were very near in time to Nagnajit, the contemporary of Nimi, probably the penultimate king of Videha. Aṅga was probably the immediate predecessor of Dadhivāhana who, according to Jaina evidence, flourished in the 6th century B.C.

[1] XIII. 5. 4. 1-23.

[2] XX. i 1. Variant readings (e.g *apyasārvabhaumaḥ*) of the relevant text seem hardly acceptable; *Cf. Baudh.* XV. 1. Even as late as the time of Bhavabhūti (eighth century A.D.) the *Aśvamedha* was looked upon as "the super-eminent touchstone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors"—*Aśvamedha iti viśva-vijayināṁ Kshatriyāṇāmūrjasvalaḥ sarva-kshatriya-paribhāvī mahānutkarsha-nishkarshaḥ* (*Uttara-Rāma-charitām*, Act IV, translated by Vināyak Sadāshiv Patvardhan). The sacrifice seems also to have been performed in early times to atone for sinful work. There was also a Vishṇuite adaptation of the famous rite—no animals being killed on the occasion, and the oblations prepared in accordance with the precepts of the *Āraṇyakas*. Reference may be made to the story of Uparichara Vasu in the *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata*,

roamed under guardianship of a hundred princes, and a hundred nobles, a hundred sons of heralds (or charioteers) and village headmen, a hundred sons of warriors and treasurers[1] (chamberlains?) equipped with various kinds of defensive and offensive weapons. If the year were successfully passed the steed was sacrificed. The features of the rite included panegyrics of the sacrificer along with righteous kings of yore by lute-players including a *Rājanya* who sings to the lute three songs made by himself, "such war he waged, such battle he won." There is also a "circle of tales," *Pāriplava Ākhyāna*[2] which lasts by series of ten days for the whole year.

The kingship disclosed in Brāhmaṇic songs and ritual is not merely a "Patriarchal Presidency." The monarch is not merely a chief noble, the first among equals, 'President of a Council of Peers.' In a famous Atharvanic laud the *rājā* of the Kurus, is extolled as a *deva* who surpassed mere mortals (*martyas*). The consecrated king is the lord of all beings. He is called *"viśvasya bhūtasya adhipati,"* and is further described as the devourer of the people—*viśāmattā.*[3] *"Rājā ta ekaṁ mukhaṁ tena mukhena viśo'tsi."*[4] He is surrounded by armed kinsmen and retainers.[5] He can "banish a Brāhmaṇa at will, mulct and overpower a Vaiśya at will, and exact labour from or slay a Śūdra at will."[6] Further he claims the power of giving his kingdom away to anybody he liked. In the *Bṛiha-*

Ch 335 339 (Raychaudhuri, *EHVS.*, 2nd ed., 132). Regarding the significance of the *Aśvamedha* see also D. C. Sircar's note in *Indian Culture*, I. pp 311 ff; II. 789ff.

[1] *Śat. Br.* XIII. 4. 2. 5. *tasyaite purastād rakshitāra upākliptā bhavanti Rājaputrāḥ kavachinaḥ śatam rājanyā nishaṅgiṇaḥ śataṁ sūtagrāmaṇyāṁ putrā ishupaishiṇaḥ śataṁ Kshātra Saṁgrahītṛiṇāṁ putrā daṇḍinaḥ śatam-aśvaśataṁ nirashṭam niramanaṁ yasminnenamapisṛijya rakshanti.*

[2] S B. E. xliv. pp. 298ff; *Pāriplava Ākhyāna* in *Śat. Br.* XIII. 4 3. 2; Keith, *Black Yajus*, pp. cxxxii f; *RPVU*, 343 f; Hopkins, GEI 365, 386

[3] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 17.

[4] *Kaush. Up.*, II. 6.

[5] *Ait. Br.* iii. 48. 'Sixty-four armed warriors assuredly were his (a Kuru's) sons and grandsons." When a Pañchāla king makes an offering there arise "Six thousand and three and thirty warriors clad in mail." *Śat. Br.* XIII 5. 4. 16; *cf.* 4. 2. 5.

[6] *Ait. Br.* vii. 29.

dāraṇyaka Upanishad Janaka says to Yājñavalkya, "*So'haṁ Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māñchāpi saha dāsyāyeti.*"[1]

The king, however, was **not an absolute despot** in practice. His power was checked, in the first place, by the Brāhmaṇas. We have seen that the most powerful sovereigns, even those who were consecrated with the *Punarabhisheka,* had to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the 'holy power' (Brahman) that was the repository of culture and education in those days. We learn from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,*[2] and the Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra*[3] that even a powerful king like Janamejaya was humbled by the Brāhmaṇas. Karāla Janaka met his doom for a crime against a Brāhmaṇa maiden. The Vṛishṇis perished on account of their irreverent conduct towards Brāhmaṇas.[4] This shows that not only kings, but republican corporations (*Saṅgha*), too, had to cultivate friendly relations with the Brāhmaṇas.

The second check was supplied by the ministers individually or in council, and village headmen who aided in the consecration of the king and whom the king consulted on important occasions. In the Vedic texts the *Sūta* and the *Grāmaṇī* are styled *Rājakartṛi* or *Rājakṛit, i.e.,* **King-maker,** "*Rājakṛitaḥ Sūta-Grāmaṇyaḥ.*"[5] The very title indicates their importance in the body politic. They, as well as the other *Ratnins,* figure prominently in the sacrifice of royal inauguration.

The existence of a Royal Council (*Sabhā*) is clearly suggested by references to *sabhāsads* in Vedic texts, particularly in connection with king Marutta Āvikshita.[6] In the *Rāmāyaṇa*[7] the *sabhā* is clearly a body in which the *Rājakartṛis* have a place along with the *amātyas* and the

[1] *Bṛih. Up.,* IV. 4. 23
[2] VII. 27.
[3] Ed. 1919, p. 11.
[4] *Cf.* also the fate of the Vaitahavyas, *Camb. Hist. Ind.* I. 121
[5] *Sat. Br.,* III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18; In *Rām* II. 67. 2; 79. 1 the king-makers are *dvijātayaḥ.*
[6] *Ait. Br.* viii 21; *Sat. Br* XIII. 5. 4 6
[7] II. 67. 2-4

Rājapurohita (royal chaplain). The claim of the ministers and headmen to be consulted is recognised in Pāli texts while dealing with the period down to the time of Bimbisāra. The *Mahāvagga* says, "King Brahmadatta of Kāsi, O Bhikkhus, having entered Benares, convoked his ministers and counsellors (*Amacce Pārisajje sannipātā petvā*)[1] and said to them: 'If you should see, my good sirs, young Dīghāvu, the son of king Dīghīti of Kosala, what would you do to him?" The *Mahā Assāroha Jātaka*[2] refers to a king who by beat of drum through the city gathered together his councillors (*amachcha, amātya*). The *Chullo-Sutasoma Jātaka* refers to the eighty thousand councillors of a king headed by his general,[3] (*Senāpati-pamukhāni asīti amachcha-sahassāni*). The power of councillors (*amātyas*) to depose a prince and elect a king is recognised in the *Pādañjali, Saṁvara,* and *Sonaka Jātakas* respectively. There is evidence regarding special gemots of village headmen. We are told that "when Seṇiya Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, was holding an assembly of the eighty thousand *Grāmikas* (Village headmen) he sent message to Soṇa Kolivisa."[4]

Another check was supplied by the general body of the people (*Jana, Mahājana*) who were distinct from the ministers and *Grāmaṇīs*, or *Grāmikas*, and who used to meet in an assembly styled **Samiti** or **Parishad** in the *Upanishads.*[5] In the *Utkrośana* passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[6] the people (*Janāḥ*) are clearly distinguished from the *Rājakartāraḥ* among whom, according to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[7] were included the *Sūta* and the

[1] S.B.E., XVII, 304; *Vinayapiṭakam* (Oldenberg), I (1879), p. 348 Cf *Rām.*, II, 79, *sāmātyāḥ saparishadaḥ.*

[2] No. 302.

[3] Cowell's *Jātaka*, V, p. 97 (No. 525); eighty thousand is a stock number and should not be taken too literally.

[4] *Mahāvagga* S. B. E. XVII, p. 1.

[5] In the *Jaim. Up. Br.* II. 11. 4. we find a reference to the *Parishad*, the *Sabhā* and the *Saṁsad*. It is not clear, if these are distinct institutions. The *sabhā* and the *samiti* are, however, distinguished in the *Atharva-Veda*.

[6] VIII, 17; cf. *Śat. Br.* V. 33. 12.

[7] III, 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18.

Grāmaṇī.[1] That the *Samiti* or *Parishad* was an assembly of the whole people, is apparent from such expressions as "*bhūyishṭhāḥ Kuru-Pañchālāssāgatā bhavitāraḥ* . . . .",[2] "*Pañchālānāṁ Samitim eyāya*", "*Pañchālānāṁ Parishadam ājagāma*," "*samaggā Śivayo hutvā*". The *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[3] mentions the *Samiti* of the *Pañchāla* people presided over by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivāli, *Śvetaketurh Āruṇeyaḥ Pañchālānāṁ Samitim eyāya; taṁ ha Pravāhaṇo Jaivālir uvācha*." The *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upanishad*[4] uses the term *Parishad* instead of *Samiti*, "*Śvetaketur ha vā Āruṇeyaḥ Pañchālānāṁ Parishadam-ājagāma*." The analogy of the Lichchhavi *Parishā* and of similar assemblies mentioned in Buddhist works shows that the functions of the Kuru and Pañchāla *Parishads* were not necessarily confined to philosophical discussions only. The *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa*[5] refers to disputations (*saṁvāda*) and witnesses (*upadrashṭṛi*) in connection with popular assemblies, and informs us that the procedure among the Kurus and the Pañchālas was different from that of *Śūdras*. The people took part in the ceremony of royal inauguration.[6] The *Dummedha Jātaka*[7] refers to a joint assembly of ministers, Brāhmaṇas, the gentry, and the other orders of the people.

That the people actually put a curb on royal absolutism is proved by the testimony of the *Atharva-Veda*[8] where it is stated that concord between king and assembly was essential for the former's prosperity. We have evidence that the people sometimes expelled and even executed their

[1] For Mahājana, see *Jātaka* (525), Vol. V, p. 187; *Jātakas* (542, 547), Vol. VI, p. 156, 489 etc.; cf. *Sat. Br.* V. 3 3. 12.

[2] "Most of the Kuru-Panchālas shall be assembled together." *Jaim Up Br.* III. 7. 6.

[3] V. 3. 1

[4] VI. 2. 1

[5] III. 7. 6.

[6] *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 17

[7] No. 50; *cf. Vessantara Jātaka* (No. 547), Vol. VI, pp. 490 ff. The whole Śivi people assembled to discuss a matter of public importance, to give advice to the king and to inflict punishment on a prince

[8] VI. 88. 3.

princes together with unpopular officials. Thus it is stated in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[1] "Now Dush-ṭaritu Pauṁsāyana had been expelled from the kingdom which had come to him through ten generations, and the Sṛiñjayas also expelled Revottaras Pāṭava Chākra *Sthapati*."[2] The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[3] refers to personages who were expelled from their kingdoms (*rāshṭras*) and who were anxious to recover them with the help of the Kshatriya consecrated with the *Punarabhisheka*. Such persons were the Indian counterparts of the French "emigrants" who sought to reclaim revolutionary France with the help of the troops of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns.[4] We learn from the *Vessantara Jātaka*[5] that the king of the Śivis (Śibis) was compelled to banish prince Vessantara in obedience to "the people's sentence" (*Sivīnaṁ vachanatthena saṁhā raṭṭhā nirajjati*).

The king was told:

"Sache tvaṁ na karissasi Sivīnaṁ vachanaṁ idaṁ maññe taṁ saha puttena Sivīhatthe karissare ti"
The bidding of the Sivi folk if you refuse to do
The people then will act, methinks, against your son and you.

The king replied:

"Eso che Sivīnaṁ chhando chhandaṁ na panudāmase"
Behold the people's will, and I that will do not gainsay.

The *Padakusalamānava Jātaka*[6] tells a story how the town and the countryfolk of a kingdom assembled (*jānapadā negamā cha samāgatā*), beat the king and priest to death as they became a source, not of weal, but of woe (lit. fear, *yato khemaṁ tato bhayaṁ*), and anointed a good man as king. A similar story is told in the *Sachchaṁkira Jātaka*.[7] We are told in the *Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka*[8] that

[1] XII. 9. 3. 1 *et seq.*; Eggeling, V 269.
[2] For the designation '*Sthapati*' see *ante*, p. 167
[3] VIII. 10
[4] *Cf.* Lodge, *Modern Europe*, p. 517.
[5] No. 547; Text VI. 490-502. The Śibis are known to *Ait. Br.* viii, 23
[6] No. 432.
[7] No. 73.
[8] No. 542.

the people of one kingdom killed the minister, deposed the king, made him an outcaste and anointed a prince as king. The ex-king was not allowed to enter into the capital city. Fick[1] points out that in the *Telapatta Jātaka* a king of Takshaśilā says that he has no power over the subjects of his kingdom. This is in striking contrast with the utterance of Janaka quoted above.[2] Evidently the Royal power had declined appreciably, at least in some of the north-western *Janapadas*, since the days of Janaka.[3]

[1] *The Social Organisation in North-East India*, trans. by Dr. S. K. Maitra, pp. 113-114. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar follows him in *Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, 134f.

[2] P. 172, "*Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi*".

[3] Note the references to elected kings (e.g. amongst the Kathaioi) and autonomous folks by the historians of Alexander in the fourth century B.C. The Ambashṭhas had a strong monarchy in the Brāhmaṇa period (*Ait. Br.* viii. 21). In the days of Alexander (*Inv. Alex.* 252) the constitution was democratic

PART II

Political History of Ancient India

PART II

From the Coronation of Bimbisāra to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

SECTION I. FOREWORD

The following pages deal with the political history of India from the time of Bimbisāra to that of the Guptas. For this period we are fortunately in possession of authentic historical materials in addition to literary tradition to which reference has already been made in the first part of the book. These materials are derived principally from the following sources: inscriptions, coins, accounts left by foreign observers and works of Indian authors of known date and authenticity.

Inscriptions engraved on stone and copper undoubtedly form the most copious and important source. Hardly less important are the coins which constitute almost the sole evidence of the history of certain dynasties and republican communities of the second and first centuries B. C. Foreign accounts, especially the records of Greek diplomats and navigators and of Chinese annalists and pilgrims, are especially valuable in connection with the vexed question of Indian chronology. Works of Indian writers of known epochs, that illumine the darkness of our period, and afford interesting 'glimpses of political history, are extremely rare and comprise the *Mahābhāshya* (Great Commentary) of Patañjali, the

Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā of Kumāralāta, the *Life of Vasubandhu* by Paramārtha and the *Harsha-charita* (Deeds of Harsha) by Bāṇabhaṭṭa.

For the history of the period from Bimbisāra to Aśoka the writer of these pages cannot in some respects claim much originality. The subject has been treated by Rhys Davids and Smith, and a flood of new light has been thrown on particular dynasties by Geiger, Bhandarkar, Rapson, Jayaswal, Malalasekera, Jackson, Herzfeld, Hultzsch and others. Use has in some cases been made of the information contained in their works, and it has been supplemented with fresh data gathered mainly from epical, Jaina, Buddhist and classical sources. As instances it may be pointed out that attention to the name Haryaṅka, given to the Bimbisārid family by Aśvaghosha, was first drawn in these pages. The tradition recorded in the *Harsha-charita* and Jaina works regarding the tragic end of Śiśunāga's line and origin of the Nandas has been collated with the evidence of the Graeco-Latin writers. Epic data have been used largely to illustrate the dawn of Magadhan ascendancy, locate tribes like the Kambojas and the Pulindas who figure in the Aśokan edicts, and to explain expressions like *stryadhyaksha, bihārayātrā, anusaṁyāna,* etc. Old materials have also been presented in many cases in a new shape, and the author's conclusions are often different from those of former writers.

In the chapter on the Later Mauryas the author has examined the causes of the dismemberment of the Maurya Empire, and drawn pointed attention to the Gārgī Saṁhitā, the Hou Hanshu, etc. and has tried to demonstrate the unsoundness of the current theory that "the fall of the Maurya authority was due in large measure to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas."[1]

The treatment of the history of the Early Post-Mauryan and Scythian periods, though not entirely

[1] The Chapter on the Later Mauryas was published in the JASB, 1920 (No 16, pp 305 ff.).

original, is different in many respects from that of previous authors. It has not been possible to accept the current views with regard to the lineage of Pushyamitra and the history and chronology of several dynasties, notably of the Early Śātavāhanas, the Greeks of Śākala, and the Śaka-Pahlavas of the *Uttarāpatha* or North-West India. As early as 1923 the writer of these pages assigned to the Nāgas of the Jumna valley and Eastern Malwa and the Bhāraśivas their proper place in the history of the post-Kushan period, a fact which has been ignored in some wellknown publications.

In the account of the Gupta period use has been made of the mass of fresh materials accumulated since the publication of the works of Bühler, Fleet, Smith and Allan. The notices of the most famous ruling family of the age in early epigraphs and literature, which are sometimes overlooked, have received due attention, its relations with southern dynasties like the Vākāṭakas have been discussed, and an attempt has been made to present a connected history of the so-called 'Later Guptas.'[1]

SECTION II. LOCAL AUTONOMY AND IMPERIAL UNITY.

The chief interest of the political history of the post-Bimbisārian Age lies in the interplay of two opposing forces, one centrifugal, the other centripetal, *viz.*, the love of local (*Jānapada*) autonomy and the aspiration for imperial unity. The former ideal is best expressed in the words of Manu—*sarvaṁ paravaśaṁ duḥkham, sarvam ātmavaśaṁ sukham,*[2] "subjection to others is full of misery, subjection to self leads to happiness." The predilection for local self-rule was in part fostered by geographical conditions. The intersection of the land of India by deep rivers and winding chains of mountains

[1] The Chapter on the so-called Later Guptas was published in the *JASB.*, 1920 (No. 19, pp. 313 ff).

[2] *Manusaṁhitā*, IV 160.

flanked by dreary deserts or impenetrable forests, developed a spirit of isolation and cleft the country asunder into small political units whose divergences were accentuated by the infinite variety of local conditions. But the vast riparian plain of the north and the extensive plateau in the interior of the Deccan Peninsula, decked with green by the life-giving streams that flow from the majestic heights of the Himālayas and the Western Ghats, fostered an opposite tendency—an inclination towards union and coalescence. The sands which choked the Sarasvatī, the floods that swelled the Lauhītya, the dangers that lurked in the Mahāṭavī proved no effective bar to unity. The five hills of Girivraja could not permanently withstand the conquering heroes who were charged with an imperial mission. The head of the Vindhya bent in reverence before the sage who was bringing the culture of the Ganges valley to the banks of the Godāvarī and the Tāmraparṇī.

The desire for union under one political authority became manifest as early as the Brāhmaṇa period and found expression in passages like the following:—

"May he (the king) be all-encompassing, possessed of all the earth, possessed of all life, from the one end up to the further side of the earth bounded by the ocean, sole ruler (*ekarāṭ*)."

The ideal persists throughout our period and inspired poets and political philosophers who spoke of the thousand *yojanas* (leagues) of land that stretch from the Himālayas to the sea as the proper domain of a single universal emperor (*chakravarti-kshetra*) and eulogised monarchs who protected the earth decked with the Ganges, as with a pearl necklace, adorned with the Himavat and the Vindhya, as with two earrings, and robed with a swinging girdle in the shape of the rocking oceans.

The imperial ideal had to contend with the centrifugal tendencies of *Jānapada* (provincial and tribal) autonomy. The two forces operated in successive epochs almost with

the regularity of the swing of the pendulum. The aspiration for a unity that transcended local boundaries owed its success not a little to the presence of another factor in Indian politics—the danger threatening from foreign invaders. It was only when the "earth was harassed by the barbarians" (*Mlechchhairudvejyamānā*) that she sought refuge in the strong arms of Chandra Gupta Maurya, the first great historical emperor of India—whose dominions undoubtedly overstepped the limits of *Āryāvarta*. Among the early empire-builders of the south was a prince who rid his country of the Scythians, Greeks and Parthians (*Saka-Yavana-Pahlava-nishūdana*). And the rulers who revived the imperial glory of the Gangetic Provinces in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., were warriors who humbled the pride of the Scythian "Son of Heaven" and braved the wrath of the Śaka king in his own city. According to sacred legends Vishṇu in the shape of a Boar had rescued the earth in the aeon of universal destruction. It is significant that the worship of the Boar Incarnation became widely popular in the Gupta-Chalukya period. The poet Viśākhadatta actually identifies the man in whose arms the earth found refuge when harassed by the *Mlechchhas*, who "shook the yoke of servitude from the neck" of his country, with the *Vārāhītanu* (Boar form) of the Self-Existent Being. Powerful emperors both in the north and the south recalled the feats of the Great Boar and the mightiest ruler of a dynasty that kept the Arabs at bay for centuries actually took the title of *Ādivarāha* or the Primeval Boar. The Boar Incarnation then symbolized the successful struggle of Indians against the devastating floods issuing from the regions outside their borders that threatened to overwhelm their country and civilisation in a common ruin.

CHAPTER II

The Rise of Magadha

Sarvamūrddhābhishiktānāmesha mūrddhni jvalishyati
prabhāharo' yaṁ sarveshāṁ jyotishāmiva bhāskaraḥ
enamāsādya rājānaḥ samṛiddha-balavāhanā
vināśamupayāsyanti śalabhā iva pāvakam.

—*Mahābhārata.*[1]

Section I. General Character of the Period C. 544 B. C. to 324 B. C.

The most remarkable feature of the age that commenced with the coronation of Bimbisāra c. 545—44 B.C.,[2] and ended with the retirement of Alexander from India and the accession of Chandra Gupta Maurya (324 B.C.), is the rise of a New Monarchy in the Eastern part of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent which is already heralded by a *Brāhmaṇa* passage cited above.[3]:

"In this eastern quarter (*prāchyāṁ diśi*), whatever kings there are of the eastern peoples, they are anointed for supreme kingship (*Sāmrājya*); 'O supreme king (*Samrāṭ*) they style them when anointed."

The eastern peoples, *prāchyas*, are not enumerated in the same manner as those of the southern, the northern and the central regions. But it may be safely assumed that the name used in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* stands for the Prasii of the Graeco-Roman writers. The most famous nations of the east in the *Brāhmaṇa-Upanishad* period were the Kāśis, the Kosalas and the Videhas. But a new star was soon in the ascendant. Under the vigorous kings of the race of Bimbisāra and Nanda Magadha played the same part in ancient Indian politics as Wessex did in pre-

[1] II 19 10 11
[2] See below, Section VII
[3] Pp 156-7

Norman England and Prussia in Hohenzollern Germany. Several circumstances contributed to the pre-eminence of the new aspirant for imperial power—its position of vantage between the upper and lower parts of the vast riparian plain of Northern India, the possession of an almost unassailable stronghold amidst five hills, and another at and near the confluence of several rivers, the arteries of commerce and navigation in those days, a superbly rich and fruitful soil, and resources including a powerful elephant corps which greatly impressed the classical writers and writers in polity.

But strategic position and material wealth cannot suffice to raise a nation to greatness. As Burke says, it is the quality and spirit of the people 'that give all their life and efficacy to them'. As in several Atlantic lands, so in Magadha, we have a fusion of folks and cultures. Kīkaṭas mixed here with enterprising clans coming from upper India as Celts did with Latins and Teutons in Mediaeval France and some adjoining territories. It is not difficult to find out two strands in the cultural—no less than the racial—texture of the population. The same nation that produced relentless fighters and. exterminators of kings' and clans like Jarāsandha of epic legend, Ajātaśatru, Mahāpadma, Chaṇḍāśoka (the ruthless conqueror of Kaliṅga) and perhaps Samudra Gupta, hearkened at the same time to the devout teachings of Madhyama Prātibodhīputra, Varddhamāna Mahāvīra, and Gautama Buddha, and played a conspicuous part in the propagation of a world religion as it did in the establishment of an empire embracing nearly the whole of India. The birth of Ajātaśatru and the enlightenment of the Buddha took place in the same country and the same age, and they met in Rājagṛiha as Charles V and Martin Luther did at Worms. The symbol of aggressive imperialism stood face to face with the preacher of piety and morality, leader of a movement that was destined to convulse a continent. The two ideologies did not long remain apart. They were harmonised and the magician who worked the miracle was Dharm-āśoka who

combined in himself the imperial tradition of his forbears as well as the spiritual fervour of the sage of the Śākyas.

A characteristic of the people of Magadha was an elasticity of social behaviour which was absent in the system which developed on the banks of the Sarasvatī and the Dṛishadvatī. In their country Brāhmaṇas could associate with *Vrātyas*, the *Rājanya* could admit the *Śūdra* girl to the harem, the *Vaiśya* and even the *Yavana* could be promoted to gubernatorial office, hereditary rulers of aristocratic lineage could be expelled to make room for the offspring of a *nagara-sobhinī*, and the "royal throne of kings" was not beyond the reach of a barber.

Magadhan rulers and chancellors like Vassakāra (Varshakāra) and Kauṭilya, were not over-scrupulous in their methods. Tradition credits some of them with the use of Machiavellian diplomacy in disintegrating kingdoms and republics, and invention of engines of destruction which worked with deadly effect. But they had the sagacity to evolve an administrative system in which princes royal, ministers of state as well as leading men of villages had their due share. Foreign diplomats and pilgrims in the fourth century B.C., as well as the fifth and seventh centuries A. D. speak of their sense of justice, their hospitals, charitable institutions and public works. They believed in ceaseless endeavour with the object of realising the dream of a united Jambudvīpa (Greater India) integrated by political as well as spiritual ties. In the *Māgadha* bards, the rulers of Girivraja and Pāṭaliputra had a body of devoted men who could rouse popular enthusiasm in a cause in which they believed. These singers and chroniclers have left a legacy which is invaluable to the student of ancient history.

The rise of Magadha synchronised with, and may have been a contributory cause of, an exodus of people from the *Madhya-deśa* to the outlying parts of India, notably the west and the south. The displacement of the Yādavas in antiquity is vouched for by epic tradition. It is well-known that the Vṛishṇis and cognate clans of Dvārkā in

Kāthiāwār and several peoples of the Deccan claimed Yadu lineage. It was in the period under review that the Far South of India comes definitely within the geographical horizon of the grammarians and foreign diplomats some of whom graced the *Durbar* of Magadhan kings. *Sapta-Sindhu* had at last developed into *Jambudvīpa*. And the time was not distant when a notable attempt would be made to impress the stamp of unity on it in the domain of culture and politics.

In making their prowess felt throughout the vast sub-continent of India the great men of Magadha had at first to face three problems, *viz*., those presented by the re-publics mainly on their northern frontier, the monarchies that grew up on the Rāptī, the Jumna and the Chambal and the foreign impact that made itself felt in the Punjab and Sind. We turn first to the republics.

Section II. Republics in the Age of Bimbisāra

It was Rhys Davids who first drew pointed attention to the survival, side by side with the monarchies, of a number of small aristocratic republics in the age of the Buddha and of Bimbisāra.[1] The most important amongst these states were the **Vṛijians** of North Bihār and the **Mallas** of Kusinārā (Kuśīnagara) and Pāvā. An account of both these peoples has already been given.[2] Among the smaller republics we find mention of the Śākyas of Kapila-vastu, the Koliyas of Devadaha and Rāmagāma, the Bhag-gas (Bhargas) of Suṁsumāra Hill, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Kālāmas of Kesaputta, and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana.

The Śākyas were settled in the territory bordered on the north by the Himālayas, on the east by the river Rohiṇī,[3] and on the west and south by the Rāptī.[4] Their

[1] *Buddhist India*, p. 1.

[2] *Supra* pp. 118ff, 126ff.

[3] A tributary of the Rāptī (Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 96). Cunningham (AGI, new ed. 476) identifies it with the Kobāna.

[4] Rapson, *Ancient India*, p. 161; Oldenberg, *Buddha*, pp. 95-96.

capital, Kapilavastu, stood close to the western bank of the Rohiṇī, some eight miles to the west of the famous Lumbinīvana,[1] the place of the Buddha's nativity, the site of which is marked by the Rummindeī pillar of one of the greatest of his followers.[2] The city is possibly mentioned in the *Tīrthayātrā* section of the *Mahābhārata*[3] under the name of *Kapilāvaṭa*. It was connected by roads with the capitals of the Kosalas and the Vṛijikas, and through them with the other great cities of the age. The Śākyas had a town called Devadaha which they appear to have shared with their eastern neighbours, the Koliyas. They acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of Kosala and, like him, claimed to belong to the solar (*Āditya*) race and Ikshvāku family.

The **Koliyas** claim to have been cadets from the royal house of Benares Tradition connects them with the cities of Rāmagāma and Devadaha[4] The river Rohiṇī separated their capital from that of the Śākyas, and helped to irrigate the fields of both the clans.[5] "Once upon a time in the month of *Jeṭṭhamūla* when the crops began to flag and droop, the labourers from amongst both the peoples assembled together." Then followed a scramble for water. Bloodshed was averted by the mediation of the Buddha.[6] From the mutual recriminations in which they indulged, we learn that the Śākyas had the custom of marrying their own sisters. Cunningham places the Koliya country between the Kohāna and Aumi (Anomā) rivers. The Anomā seems to have formed the dividing line between the Koliyas on the one hand and the Mallas and Moriyas on the other.

The **Bhaggas** (Bhargas) are known to the *Aitareya*

[1] AGI (new ed.) 476

[2] Kapilavastu is sometimes identified with Piprāwa in the north of the Bastī district, or Tilaura Koṭ and neighbouring ruins in the Tarai about 10 miles to the N.W of Piprāwā (Smith, *EHI*, third ed., p. 159.)

[3] III, 84. 31

[4] DPPN, I 689f The Koliya capital stood close to the eastern bank of the Rohiṇī

[5] The *Kunāla Jātaka* (introductory portion)

[6] DPPN, I. 690, Cunn. AGI (new) 477; 491 ff

Brāhmaṇa[1] and the *Ashṭādhyayī* of Paṇini.[2] The former work refers to the Bhārgāyaṇa prince Kairiśi Sutvan. In the latter half of the sixth century B.C., the Bhagga state was a dependency of the Vatsa kingdom; for we learn from the preface to the *Dhonasākha Jātaka*,[3] that prince Bodhi, the son of Udayana, king of the Vatsas, dwelt in Suṁsumāragiri and built a palace called *Kokanada*. The *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṁśa* also testify to the close connection between the Vatsas and the Bhargas (Bhaggas) and their proximity to the Nishādas. The testimony of the epic and the *Apadāna* seems to locate them in the Vindhyan region between the Jumna and the Śon.[4]

Regarding the **Bulis** and the **Kālāmas** we know very little. The *Dhammapada commentary*[5] refers to the Buli territory as the kingdom of Allakappa, and says that it was only ten leagues in extent. From the story of its king's intimate relationship with king Veṭhadīpaka it may be presumed that Allakappa lay not far from Veṭhadīpa, the home of a famous Brāhmaṇa in the early days of Buddhism, who made a cairn over the remains of the Buddha in his native land.[6] The Kālāmas were the clan of the philosopher Ālāra, a teacher of Gautama before he attained to *Sambodhi*.[7] The name of their *nigama* (town) Kesaputta, reminds us of the Keśins, a people mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[8] and probably also in the *Ashṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini,[9] and connected with the Pañchālas and Dālbhyas who appear in the *Rig-Veda*,[10] as settled on the banks of the Gomatī. Kesaputta itself seems to have been annexed to

[1] VIII. 28.

[2] IV i III. 177

[3] No 353.

[4] *Mbh*., II. 30. 10-11, *Hariv*., 29 73. DPPN, II, 345. *Supra* p 133

[5] Harvard Oriental Series, 28, p. 247

[6] Majumdar Śāstrī connects Veṭhadīpa with Kasia (AGI, 1924, 714); *cf* Fleet in JRAS, 1906, p. 900 n; Hoey suggests that Veṭhadīpa is Bettiah in the Champaran District of Bihār.

[7] *Buddhacharita*, XII. 2.

[8] *Ved. Ind*., Vol I, p. 186

[9] VI. 4. 165.

[10] V. 61.

Kosala,[1] and no doubt acknowledged the suzerainty of the king of that powerful state.

The **Moriyas** (Mauryas) were the same clan which gave Magadha its greatest dynasty.[2] They are sometimes spoken of as of Śākyan origin, but the evidence is late. Earlier evidence distinguishes between these two clans.[3] The name is derived, according to one tradition, from *mora* (*mayūra*) or peacock. The place where they settled down is said to have always resounded with the cries of these birds. Pipphalivana, the Moriya capital, is apparently identical with the Nyagrodhavana or Banyan Grove, mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, where stood the famous Embers Tope.[4] Fa Hien tells us that the Tope lay four *yojanas* to the east of the river Anomā, and twelve *yojanas* (probably some 54 miles) to the west of Kusinārā.[5]

It will perhaps not be quite out of place to say here a few words about the internal **organisation** of the republics. Space, however, forbids a detailed treatment of the subject. They fall mainly into two classes, *viz.*, those that were constituted by the whole or a section of a single clan (*kula*) *e.g.*, the Śākyas, the Koliyas, the Mallas of Kusinārā, the Mallas of Pāvā etc., and those that comprised several clans like the Vṛijis (Vajjis) and the Yādavas. The distinguishing feature of a state of this type is the absence of *one* single hereditary monarch who exercised *full* control over it. The *Basileus*, if he survived at all, must have done so as a mere magistracy or as a dignified part of the constitu-

[1] The *Aṅguttara* (P. T. S., I, 188; Nipāta, III. 65).

[2] "Then did the Brāhmaṇa Cānakka anoint a glorious youth, known by the name Candagutta, as king over all Jambudipa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyas." Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, p. 27; DPPN, II. 673.

[3] *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta.*

[4] Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas*, p. 135; Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II, pp. 23 24; Cunningham, *AGI.*, *new ed.*, pp 491f, 496f.

[5] *AGI* (new) 491, Legge, *Fa Hien*, p. 79; Watters, I, 141; *cf.* JRAS., 1903. As Kasia (Kusinārā, Kuśīnagara) lay 35 miles to the east of Gorakhpur (*AGI*, 493), the Moriyan city could not have been situated very far from the last-mentioned town. The Moriyas seem also to have been close neighbours of the Koliyas beyond the Anomā and the Mallas of Anupiyā on the banks of that river.

tion.[1] The efficient part comprised a president (chief, *gaṇapati*, *gaṇajyeshtha*, *gaṇarāja*, *saṁghamukhya*) and a council of archons taken from the ruling class. Such a president was Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī and Akouphis of Nysa in later times, the terrestrial counterpart of Indra, in his capacity as the *Jyeshṭha* of the Marud *gaṇa*.[2] According to a Jaina tradition the number of members of the supreme executive in charge of foreign and military affairs was in some states nine.[3] There were functionaries like *uparājās* and *senāpatis* who exercised judicial and military functions. All these Elders possibly answer to the *Mahallakas* of Pāli texts and *Mahattaras* of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*,[4] whom it was the duty of the citizens to respect and support.

Some of the clans possibly had an elaborate system of judicial procedure with a gradation of officers. Others, notably the Koliyas, had a police force which earned notoriety for extortion and violence.[5] Reverence for tradition, especially for traditional religion with its shrines and ministers, was a feature that recalls the part that ancestral religion played in ancient Babylonia and modern Nippon.

Perhaps the most important institution of the free republics was the *Parishā*, the popular assembly, where young and old held frequent meetings, made their decisions and carried them out in concord. Kettledrums[6] were used by an officer (styled *sabhāpāla* in the epic) to bring the people to the Mote Hall, called *Santhāgāra* in the Pali texts. The procedure is perhaps analogous to that followed in the Kuru-Pañchāla assembly mentioned in the *Jaiminīya Upanishad Brāhmaṇa*, in a palaver in Śakra's heaven

[1] Cf. the case of Ugrasena among the Yādavas.

[2] *Rig-veda*, I. 23. 8; cf. II. 23. 1.

[3] *Nava Mallaī*, *Nava Lechchhaī* etc. *supra* p. 125. In Nysa the governing body consisted of 300 members. The number of "leading men of cities and provinces" entrusted by the Kshudrakas with power to conclude a treaty is not definitely stated.

[4] *Vāyu*, 96. 35.

[5] *DPPN*, I. 690.

[6] *Kindred Sayings*, II. 178 (reference to kettledrum of the Dasārhas; cf. *Mbh.*, I. 220. 11.

described in the *Mahāgovinda Suttanta*, or in formal gatherings of the Chapters of the Buddhist Order referred to in the *Vinaya* texts. Members "are seated in a specified order. After the president has laid the proposed business before the assembly, others speak upon it, and recorders take charge of the unanimous decision arrived at."[1] If there is any disputation (*saṃvāda*) the matter is referred to a committee of arbitrators. It is possible that technical expressions like *āsana-prajñāpaka* (seat-betokener), *ñatti* (*jñapti*, motion), *śalākā-gāhāpaka* (ballot-collector), *gaṇa-pūraka* (whip), *ubbāhikā* (referendum) found in the Rules of the Order, were adopted from those in use in the assemblies of the free tribes or clans.

SECTION III. THE MINOR PRINCIPALITIES AND THE GREAT MONARCHIES

An important feature of Indian history throughout the ages is the presence of numerous petty *Rājās* holding their courts either in some forest region, mountain fastness, or desert tract away from the main currents of political life, or in a riparian or maritime district, each separated from his neighbour by a range of hills, a stream, a forest or an expanse of sandy waste. It is impossible to enumerate all such tiny states that flourished and decayed in the days of Bimbisāra. But a few deserve notice. Among these were Gandhāra ruled by Paushkarasārin or Pukkusāti, a remote predecessor of Ambhi, Madra governed by the father of Khemā, a queen of Bimbisāra, Roruka (in Sauvīra or the Lower Indus Valley) under the domination of Rudrāyaṇa,[2] Śurasena ruled by Avantiputta (either a successor of, or identical with, Subāhu), and Aṅga under the sway of Dṛiḍhavarman and Brahmadatta.

It is difficult to say anything about the ethnic affiliation of these rulers The form of the names indicates

[1] *Jaim. Up Br.*, III 7. 65. *Camb Hist. Ind.*, I. 176; cf., *Carm Lec.*, 1918, 180ff

[2] *Divyāvadāna*, p 545.

that they were either Aryans themselves or had come under the influence of Aryan culture. But there were certain principalities which were definitely styled Nishāda in the epic, and Ālavaka (forest-folk of Yaksha-infested land) in the Pāli texts and were doubtless of non-Aryan origin.

One of these, the realm of **Ālavaka** [1] demands some notice as the relic of a past that was fast disappearing. This little state was situated near the Ganges and was probably identical with the Chanchu territory visited by Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang). Cunningham and Smith identify it with the Ghāzipur region.[2] The name is derived from the capital Ālavī[3] (Sanskrit *Aṭavī*, cf. *Āṭavika*) or Ālabhiya[4] which stood close to a large forest that doubtless suggested the particular nomenclature.[5] In the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* Ālavī finds a place in a list of twenty famous cities: Bārāṇasī, Sāvatthī, Vesālī, Mithilā, Ālavī, Kosambhī, Ujjenī, Takkasilā, Champā, Sāgala, Suṁsumāragira, Rājagaha, Kapilavatthu, Sāketa, Indapaṭṭa, Ukkaṭṭha,[6] Pāṭaliputtaka, Jettuttara,[7] Saṁkassa[8] and Kusinārā. The *Chullavagga*[9] mentions the Aggālave shrine at Ālavī which the Buddha honoured by his visits, as it lay on the way between the capitals of Kosala and Magadha. In the *Uvāsaga-dasāo* the king of Ālabhiyā is named *Jiyasattū* (Jita-śatru, conqueror of enemies). But *Jiyasattū* seems to have been a common designation of kings[10] like

[1] *Sutta Nipāta*, S. B. E., X, II. 29-30.

[2] Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II, pp. 61, 340.

[3] *Sutta Nipāta*. *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, Vol I p 275

[4] *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, p. 103, Appendix, pp. 51-53

[5] *Cf. The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, Vol. I, p 160. The derivation of the name of the country from *aṭavī* was suggested by Hoernle who also pointed out the reference in the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* *Cf* also the references to forest peoples and kingdoms in the inscriptions of Aśoka and Samudra Gupta.

[6] A town in the Kingdom of Kosala (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, I. 108).

[7] Near Chitor (N. L. Dey).

[8] Sanskrit Sāṅkāśya or Kapitthikā which is identified by Cunningham with Sankisa on the Ikshumatī river, in the Farukhabad District, U. P. (Cunn. AGI. new ed., pp. 422f, 706)

[9] VI. 17; *cf.* also *Gradual Sayings*, IV. 147; DPPN, I. 295

[10] *Cf. Amitrāṇāṁ hantā* of the *Ait. Br* The Essay on Guṇādhya (1891) mentions Hatthālavaka as the king of Ālavī.

To face page 174

the epithet *Devānampiya* of a later age.[1] The name is given also to the rulers of **Sāvatthi** Kampilla, Mithilā, **Champā** Vāṇiyagāma, Bārāṇasī and Polasapura, who were all contemporaries of Mahāvīra.[2] Buddhist writers refer to other "Yakkha" principalities besides Ālavaka.[3]

The most important factors in the political history of the period were, however, neither the republics nor the forest principalities but the **four Great Kingdoms** of Kosala, Vatsa, Avanti and Magadha.

In **Kosala** king Mahākosala had been succeeded by his son Pasenadi or Prasenajit. As already stated, the Kosalan monarchy had spread its tentacles over a vast area extending perhaps from the Gumtī to the Little Gaṇḍak and from the Nepalese Tarāi to the Ganges, possibly even to the eastern part of the Kaimur range. It counted amongst its vassals several *rājās*,[4] including, doubtless, the rulers of the Kāśis, the Śākyas and the Kālāmas. Among its officials were two Mallas, Bandhula and his nephew Dīrgha Chārāyaṇa,[5] who must have helped their sovereign to secure influence in the tiny state beyond the Little Gaṇḍak from which they came. "Nine Mallakis" appear as allies of the rulers of Kāsi-Kosala in Jaina texts. Friendship with the "Visālikā Lichchhavī" and with Seniya Bimbisāra,[6] the master of Magadha, must have favoured peaceful penetration in the east and left the king free to organise his kingdom and dealing drastically with robbers and savages who

[1] In Babylon, however, the style "favourite of the gods" is found as early as the age of Hammurabi (*Camb. And Hist*, I, p 511; *I. C.*, April-June, 1946, p. 241)

[2] *Cf.* Hoernle, *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 106, 118, 166. In the *Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūla Kalpa* (ed. G Śāstrī, p. 645), a king of Gauḍa is styled "*Jitaśatru*". It is absurd to suggest, as does Hoernle (p. 103 n), that Jiyasattū, Prasenajit and Cheḍaga were identical. Cf. *Indian Culture*, II. 806

[3] *Cf. Sutta Nipāta*, S.B.E., Vol. X, ii, p. 45.

[4] For the identification of the *Rājās*, see Part I *ante*, 155f.

[5] *Majjhima N*, II, p. 118. He is probably identical with the person of that name mentioned in the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* and inscriptions (*nītivijita-Chārāyaṇah, Ep. Ind.*, III. 210) as a writer on polity, and by Vātsyāyana as an authority on Erotics.

[6] *Majjhima N.*, II, p. 101.

menaced the road from Śāketa to Sāvatthī, and interfered with the peaceful life of the monks.[1]

The character of such a man, one of the leading figures of the age, who had received his education at Taxila, and became a friend of the Buddha, deserves study and we have an admirable exposition by Mrs. Rhys Davids. "He is shown combining like so many of his class all the world over, a proneness to affairs of sex with the virtues and affection of good 'family man', indulgence at the table with an equally natural wish to keep in good physical form, a sense of honour and honesty, shown in his disgust at legal cheating, with a greed for acquiring wealth and war indemnities, and a fussiness over lost property, a magnanimity towards a conquered foe with a callousness over sacrificial slaughter and the punishment of criminals. Characteristic also are both his superstitious nervousness over the sinister significance of dreams due, in reality, to disordered appetites, and also his shrewd politic care to be on good terms with all religious orders, whether he had testimonials to their genuineness or not."[2]

The family life of the king had its bearing on affairs of the state. He married a Magadhan princess which fact must have cemented his friendship with Bimbisāra, who got a Kosalan wife in return. Another queen of Pasenadi (Prasenajit) was the famous Vāsabhakkhattiyā, daughter of Mahānāman, the Śākyan, by a slave girl.[3] The issues of this marriage were a son, Viḍūḍabha (Viduratha), who rose to be his father's *senāpati* (general)[4] and afterwards his successor,[5] and a daughter Vajirā or Vajiri

[1] *Mahāvagga*, SBE., XIII, pp. 220, 261. Among the marauders was the notorious Aṅgulimāla.

[2] *Sage and king in Kosala-Saṁyutta*, Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, p 134

[3] DPPN, II. 171; 857.

[4] *For the employment of princes as Senapati*, see Kauṭilya (Mysore edition), 1919, p. 34; *cf*. 346.

[5] Viḍūḍabha's name is generally omitted in Purāṇic manuscripts. The Purāṇas, however, mention a king named Suratha. Pargiter points out (*D. K. A.*, 12, n 68) that one manuscript of the *Vishnu Purāṇa* gives the name *Viduratha* instead of Suratha, But that prince is represented as the great-grandson of Prasenajit. Similarly, the Purāṇas represent Udāyin as the grand-

Kumarī[1] who became the queen of Ajātaśatru, the successor of Bimbisāra on the throne of Magadha. The careers of the prince and the princess are bound up with memorable events, *viz.*, the war of the Kosalan king with Ajātaśatru, the loss of his throne as a result of his son's revolt, and the terrible vengeance that the latter wreaked on the Śākyas for sending the offspring of a slave woman to the Kosalan harem to become the mother of the prince.

When the Magadhan war brought disaster to the king's arms he married Mallikā, daughter of the chief of garland-makers, who sweetened his days till her death, and made herself famous by her benefactions. Among these was a garden, the Mallikārāma, which was set apart for religious discussion.[2] She leaned towards the Buddha and his order, though her husband, with great insight, extended his patronage to Brāhmaṇas as well.[3] Mallikā and Sumanā, the king's sister,[4] remind one of Kāruvākī and Rājyaśrī, famous for their charity and interest in Buddhist teaching in the days of Aśoka and Harsha respectively.

The internal organisation of the kingdom of Kosala presents some interesting features. There was a body of ministers at the centre, but they had little control over the king's whims. Those specifically mentioned by tradition were Mṛigadhara,[5] Ugga, Sri-Vaḍḍha, Kāla and Junha. The generals included the Crown Prince and some Malla chiefs. Police duties on roads were performed by soldiers. Portions of the royal domain were granted to Brāhmaṇas like Pokkharasādī, with power over them as if they were kings. The weakness of the system soon became apparent,

son of Ajātaśatru. These instances emphasize the need for a critical handling of the Purāṇic lists.

[1] *Majjhima*, II, p. 110.

[2] DPPN, II, 1557. A more famous place, Jetavana, is said to derive its name from a son of Prasenajit.

[3] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, pp. 108, 288. For Pasenadi's benefactions to the Buddha and his followers see *Gaggn Jātaka*, No. 155. For preparations for a great sacrifice see *Kindred Sayings*, I, 102.

[4] DPPN, II, 168 ff, 172, 1245.

[5] Hoernle, *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II, Appendix, p. 56. DPPN, I, 332, 572, 960, II, 1146.

and led to the downfall of the king. Ministers, who were lavish in their charity, were preferred to those who approved of a more economical policy, and one of the favourites is said to have actually been allowed to rule over the kingdom for seven days. The large powers granted to *Brāhmaṇa* donees must have promoted centrifugal tendencies, while the infidelity of some of the generals including the Crown Prince, and the cruel treatment by the latter, when he became king, of vassal clansmen contributed to the eventual downfall of the monarchy.

In the **Vatsa** kingdom which, probably at this time, extended along the southern frontier of Kosala, king Śatānīka Parantapa was succeeded by his son Udayana who rivals Śrī Rāmachandra, Nala and the Pāṇḍavas in being the hero of many romantic legends.[1] The commentary on the *Dhammapada* gives the story of the way in which Vāsuladattā or Vāsavadattā, the daughter of Pradyota, king of Avanti, became his queen. It also mentions two other consorts of the Vatsa king, *viz.*, Māgandiyā,[2] daughter of a Kuru Brāhmaṇa, and Sāmāvatī, the adopted child of the treasurer Ghosaka The *Milindapañho* refers to a peasant woman named Gopāla-mātā who also became his wife.[3] The *Svapna-Vāsavadatta* attributed to Bhāsa, and some other works, mention another queen named Padmāvatī who is represented as sister to king Darśaka of Magadha. The *Priyadarśikā* speaks of Udayana's marriage with Āraṇyakā, the daughter of Dṛiḍhavarman, king of Aṅga· The *Ratnāvalī* tells the story of the love of the king of Vasta and of Sāgarikā, an attendant of his chief queen Vāsavadattā. Stories about Udayana were widely current in Avanti in the time of Kālidāsa as we learn

[1] For a detailed account of the legends, see "*Essay on Guṇāḍhya and the Bṛihatkathā,*" by Prof. Félix Lacote, translated by Rev A M. Tabard. See also *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, 1920-21; Gune, '*Pradyota, Udayana, and Śreṇika*--A Jaina Legend", J. Sen, "*The Riddle of the Pradyota Dynasty*" (I. H Q., 1930, pp. 678-700); Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, *Priyadarśikā* lxii ff.; Aiyangar Com. Vol., 352 ff, Malalasekera, *DPPN*, I 379-80; II, 316, 859.

[2] *Cf.* Anupamā, *Divyāvadāna*, 36.

[3] IV. 8. 25; *DPPN*, I. 379-80.

from the *Meghadūta*: *"prāpy-Āvantīn Udayana-kathā-kovida-grāmavṛiddhān."* The *Jātakas* throw some side-light on the character of this king. In the preface to the *Mātaṅga Jātaka* it is related that in a fit of drunken rage he had Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja tortured by having a nest of ants tied to him. The *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* of Somadeva, a writer of the eleventh century A.D., contains a long account of Udayana's *Digvijaya*.[1] The *Priyadarśikā* of Śrī Harsha[2] speaks of the king's victory over the lord of Kaliṅga, and the restoration of his father-in-law Dṛiḍhavarman to the throne of Aṅga. It is difficult to disentangle the kernel of historical truth from the husk of popular fables. It seems that Udayana was a great king who really made some conquests, and contracted matrimonial alliances with the royal houses of Avanti, Aṅga and Magadha. But his career was meteoric. He left no worthy successor. Bodhi, his son by the chief queen, preferred a quiet life amidst the sylvan surroundings of Suṁsumāragiri to the troubles of imperial adventure. The kingdom, harassed by various wars, was at last overcome by its ambitious neighbour on the south-west, *viz.*, Avanti, and was governed by a prince of the royal line of Ujjain.[3]

The throne of **Avanti** was, in the days of Udayana, occupied by Chaṇḍa Pradyota Mahāsena whose daughter, Vāsavadattā, became the chief queen of the lord of the Vatsas. Regarding the character of Pradyota the *Mahāvagga* says that he was cruel.[4] The *Purāṇas* observe that he was *"nayavarjita"*, *i.e.*, destitute of good policy and add that "he will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him—*sa vai praṇata-sāmantaḥ*". He had at one time made the Vatsa king a captive and had a close relation on

[1] Tawney's Translation, Vol. I, pp. 148 ff

[2] Act IV.

[3] *Cf.* story of Maṇiprabha from *Āvaśyaka-Kathānakas*. Jacobi, *Pariśishṭaparvan*, 2nd ed. xii, Tawney, *Katha-sarit-sāgara*, II. p. 484. According to the *Āvaśyaka-Kathānaka* IV, reproduced by Bhadreśvara in his *Kahāvali*, Maṇiprabha, great grandson of Pradyota, ruled at Kauśāmbī, while his brother Avantisena exercised sway at Ujjain (Avanti).

[4] S B E., XVII, p. 187.

the throne of Mathurā. The terror that he struck among his neighbours is apparent from a statement of the *Majjhima Nikāya*[1] that Ajātaśatru, son of Bimbisāra, fortified Rājagṛiha because he was afraid of an invasion of his territories by Pradyota. He also waged war on Pushkarasārin, the king of Taxila.[2]

SECTION IV. MAGADHA CRESCENT—BIMBISĀRA

According to Jaina legend Pradyota went forth to attack Rājagṛiha even during the lifetime of Bimbisāra.[3] The last-mentioned prince, the real founder of Magadhan *imperial* power in the historic period, was the son of a petty chief of South Bihār, whose very name seems to have been forgotten. Tradition tried to fill the lacuna possibly by an imaginary nomenclature.[4] An early authority describes the family to which the prince belonged as the *Haryaṅka-kula*. As we have already seen,[5] there is no reason to discard this evidence in favour of the later tradition of the *Purāṇas*. Young Bimbisāra, who also bore the name or epithet of Seṇiya (Śreṇika), is said to have been anointed king by his own father when he was only fifteen years old.[6] The momentous event cannot fail to recall a solemn ceremony that took place some nine hundred years later when another king of Magadha clasped his favourite son in arms in the presence of the princes royal and ministers, in council assembled, and exclaimed, "Protect the entire land".

The new ruler had a clear perception of the political

[1] III. 7.

[2] Pradyota was unsuccessful in this war and was only saved from disaster by the outbreak of hostilities between Pushkarasārin and the Pāṇḍavas (*Essay on Guṇāḍhya*, 176).

[3] He was foiled by the cunning of Prince Abhava (*Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, 1920-21, 3; cf. *DPPN*, I. 128).

[4] Among the names given by various late writers we find the following: Bhātiyo (Bhaṭṭiya, Bodhisa), Mahāpadma, Hemajit, Kshemajit, Kshetrojā or Kshetrauja.

[5] *Supra*, p. 115ff.

[6] *Mahāvaṁśa* (Geiger's trans.), p. 12

situation of his time. The military power of the Vṛiji Confederation was growing in the North. Aggressive monarchies under ambitious rulers were following a policy of expansion from their bases in Śrāvastī, and Ujjain. The cruel and unscrupulous ruler of the last-mentioned city engaged in hostilities with Pushkarasārin of Taxila. The king of Taxila harassed by numerous enemies including the mysterious Pāṇḍavas who are known to have been in possession of Śākala (in the Punjab) in the days of Ptolemy, turned to the king of Magadha for help. Though ready to oblige his Gandhārian friend by receiving an embassy, Bimbisāra, who had to liquidate the long-standing feud with his eastern neighbour across the Champā, was in no mood to alienate Pradyota or any of the other military chiefs of the age.

When the king of Avanti was suffering from jaundice he sent the physician Jīvaka. He also pursued a policy of dynastic marriages like the Hapsburgs and Bourbons of Europe and contracted alliances with the ruling families of Madra,[1] Kosala[2] and Vaiśālī. These measures were of great importance They not only appeased the most formidable militarists of the age, but eventually paved the way for the expansion of the kingdom both westward and northward. Bimbisāra's Kosalan wife brought a Kāśi village producing a revenue of a hundred thousand for bath and perfume money[3] The Vaiśālian connection produced momentous consequences in the next reign.

[1] Khemā, the princess of Śākala (Madra) is said to have been the chief consort of Bimbisāra Was she connected with the Pāṇḍavas who are found in Śākala as late as the age of Ptolemy?

[2] According to the *Dhammapada Commentary* (Harvard, 29, 60, 30, 225) Bimbisāra and Pasenadi were connected by marriage, each having married a sister of the other

[3] *Jātaka* Nos 239, 283, 492 According to the *Thusa Jātaka* (338) and the *Mūshika Jātaka* (373) the Kosalan princess was the mother of Ajātasatru The preface to the *Jātakas* says, "At the time of his (*Ajātaśatru's*) conception there arose in his mother, the daughter of the king of Kosala, a chronic longing to drink blood from the right knee of king Bimbisāra". In the *Saṁyukta Nikāya* (*Book of Kindred Sayings*, 110) Pasenadi of Kosala calls *Ajātaśatru* his nephew. In Vol I. page 38n of the *Book of the Kindred Sayings* however, Maddā (Madra) appears as the name of Ajātaśatru's mother

The shrewd policy of Bimbisāra enabled him to devote his undivided attention to the struggle with Aṅga which he annexed after defeating Brahmadatta.[1] The annexation of Aṅga by Bimbisāra is proved by the evidence of the *Mahāvagga*[2] and that of the *Soṇadaṇḍa Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* in which it is stated that the revenues of the town of Champā have been bestowed by King Bimbisāra on the Brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa. We learn from Jaina sources that Aṅga was governed as a separate province under the Magadhan Crown Prince with Champā as its capital.[3] The king himself resided in Rājagṛiha-Girivraja.[4] Thus by war and policy Bimbisāra added Aṅga and a part of Kāśi to the Magadhan dominions, and launched Magadha to that career of conquest and aggrandisement which only ended when Aśoka sheathed his sword after the conquest of Kaliṅga. We learn from the *Mahāvagga* that Bimbisāra's dominions embraced 80,000[5] townships

The victories of Bimbisāra's reign were probably due in large measure to the vigour and efficiency of his administration. He exercised a rigid control over his High Officers,[6] dismissing those who advised him badly

A Tibetan writer calls her Vāsavī (DPPN, I 34) The Jaina writers represent Chellanā, daughter of Chetaka of Vaiśālī as the mother of Kūnika-Ajātaśatru The *Nikāyas* call Ajātaśatru Vedehiputta (Vaidehīputra), *i e*, son of the Videhan princess This is taken to confirm the Jaina tradition because Vaiśālī was in Videha. Buddhaghosha, however, resolves "*Vedehi*" into *Veda-iha*, *Vedena ihati* or intellectual effort (BKS Vol I, 109n) and seems to suggest that "Vedehiputta" simply means "Son of the accomplished princess" We should moreover remember that the Kosalan monarch Para Āṭnāra, had the epithet *Vaideha* and the name *Kauśalyā* was applied to several Kāśi princesses in the epic The appellation Vaidehīputra, therefore does not necessarily disprove the Kosalan parentage of the mother of Ajātaśatru According to one authority "Chelā" (Chellanā) was styled "Vaidehī" "as she was *brought* from Videha" (AIU, II, 20)

[1] JASB, 1914, p 321.

[2] *SBE*, XVII, p 1.

[3] Hemchandra, the author of the *Pariśiṣtaparvan* VII 22, *cf* also the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* and the *Nirayāvalī Sūtra* (ed Warren, p 3) King (*rāyā*) Kuniya, son of King Seniya by Chellanādevī, ruled in Champā-nagarī in Bhāratavarsha, which is in Jambudvīpa.

[4] *Sutta Nipāta*, *SBE*, X, ii, 67.

[5] Apparently a stock number.

[6] *Chullavagga* of the *Vinayapiṭaka*, VII 3 5 See also *Vinaya*, i, 73, 74f 207, 240

and rewarding those whose advice he approved of. The result of the 'purge' was the emergence of the type of official represented by Vassakāra and Sunītha. The High Officers (*Rājabhaṭa*) were divided into several classes, *viz.*, (1) *Sabbatthaka* (the officer in charge of general affairs), (2) *Senā-nāyaka Mahāmattas* (generals), and (3) *Vohārika Mahāmattas* (judges).[1] The *Vinaya* texts afford us a glimpse of the activities of these *Mahāmātras*, and the rough and ready justice meted out to criminals. Thus we have reference not only to imprisonment in jails (*kārā*), but also to punishment by scourging (*kaśā*), branding, beheading, tearing out the tongue, breaking ribs, etc. There seems to have been a fourth class of *mahāmātras* who were responsible like the village syndic and headmen (*grāmabhojaka* or *grāmakuṭa*) for the levy of the tithe on produce.[2]

In provincial administration a considerable degree of autonomy was allowed. We hear not only of a sub-king at Champā, but of *māṇḍalika rājās*[3] corresponding perhaps to the earls and counts of mediaeval European polity. But Bimbisāra, like William the Conqueror, sought to check the centrifugal tendencies of the system by a great gemote of village headmen (*grāmikas*) who are said to have assembled from the 80,000 townships of the realm.

Measures were taken for the improvement of communications and the foundation of a new royal residence. Yuan Chwang (Hiuen Tsang) refers to Bimbisāra's road and causeway, and says that when Kuśāgrapura (old Rājagṛiha) was afflicted by fires, the king went to the cemetery and built a new city. Fa Hien, however, gives the credit for the foundation of New Rājagṛiha to Ajātaśatru. The patronage of Jīvaka shows that medical arrangements were not neglected.

In one respect Bimbisāra was unfortunate. Like

[1] Another judicial officer mentioned in Pali texts (*Kindred Sayings*, II 172) is the *Vinichchhay-āmachcha*.

[2] *Camb. Hist.*, I. 199

[3] *DPPN*, II. 898.

Prasenajit he was possibly the victim of the malevolence of the Crown Prince whom he had appointed to the vice-royalty of Champā,[1] and had perhaps even admitted to royalty, following the precedent of his own father.[2] The ungrateful son, who is variously called Ajātaśatru, Kūṇika and Aśokachanda[3] is said to have put his father to death. The crime seriously affected the relations of Magadha with Kosala. Dr. Smith regards the story of the murder as 'the product of *odium theologicum*', and shows excessive scepticism in regard to the evidence of the Pāli canon and chronicles. But the general credibility of these works has been maintained by scholars like Rhys Davids and Geiger whose conclusions seem to be confirmed directly or indirectly by the testimony of independent classical and Jaina writers.[4]

SECTION V. MAGADHA MILITANT—KŪṆIKA-AJĀTAŚATRU

Whatever may have been the mode by which he acquired the throne, Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru proved to be an energetic ruler. The defences of the realm were strengthened by fortifications at Rājagṛiha and the foundation of a new stronghold at Pāṭaligrāma near the junction of the Śon and the Ganges. Like Frederick II of Prussia he carried out the policy of a father with whom his relations were by no means cordial. His reign was the highwater

[1] *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, *Nirayāvali Sūtra*, *Pariśishṭaparvan* IV. 1-9; VI 22 and the *Kathākośa*, p. 178.

[2] *Chullavagga*, VII. 3. 5. Bimbisāra seems to have sought the assistance of other sons, too, in the work of government. One of these, Abhaya (son of Padmāvatī of Ujjain or of Nandā helped his father to foil the machinations of Pradyota. Other children, recorded by tradition were Vimala Koṇḍañña by Ambapālī. Halla and Vehalla by Chellanā, Kāla, Sīlavat, Jayasena and a girl Chundī by other wives.

[3] *Kathākośa*. The *Aupapātia sūtra* styles him *Devānupiya* (*IA*, 1881, 108) a title possibly identical with *Devānaṁpiya* of inscriptions of the third century B.C.

[4] *Cf.* the Jaina attempt to whitewash Kūṇika from the stain of intentional parricide (Jacobi referring to the *Nirayāvali Sūtra* in his *Kalpa Sūtra* of Bhadravāhu, 1879, p. 5).

mark of the power of the Haryaṅka dynasty. He not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kāśi, or a part of it, but also absorbed the state of Vaiśālī. The traditional account of his **duel with Kosala** is given in Buddhist texts.[1] It is said that when Ajātaśatru murdered Bimbisāra, his father, the queen Kosalā Devī died of love for him. Even after her death the Magadhan King continued to enjoy the revenues of the Kāśi village which had been given to the lady for bath money. But Prasenajit, the sovereign of Kosala, determined that no parricide should have a village which was his by right of inheritance. War followed, sometimes the Kosalan monarch got the best of it, and sometimes the rival king. On one occasion Prasenajit fled away in defeat to his capital Śrāvastī; on another occasion he took Ajātaśatru prisoner but spared his life as he was his nephew. He confiscated the army of the captive prince but sought to appease him by the offer of the hands of his daughter Vajirā. The princess was dismissed with the Kāśi village in question, for her bath money. Her father could not enjoy the fruits of peace for more than three years.[2] During his absence in a country town, Dīgha Chārāyaṇa, the Commander-in-Chief, raised prince Viḍūḍabha to the throne.[3] The ex-king set out for Rājagṛiha, resolved to take Ajātaśatru with him and capture Viḍūḍabha. But he died from exposure outside the gates of the Magadhan metropolis.

The traditional account of the **war with Vaiśālī** is preserved in part by Jaina writers. King Seṇiya Bimbisāra is said to have given his famous elephant *Seyaṇaga* (*Sechanaka*, the sprinkler), together with a large necklace of eighteen strings of jewels, to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Chellaṇā, the daughter of *Rājā* Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī. His eldest son Kūṇiya (Ajāta-

[1] *The Book of the Kindred Sayings*, I pp. 109-110. The *Saṁyutta Nikāya* and the *Haritamāta*, *Vaddhaki-Sūkara*, *Kummā Sapiṇḍa Tachchha Sūkara* and the *Bhaddasāla Jātakas*.

[2] *DPPN*, II 172.

[3] *Bhaddasāla Jātaka*

śatru), after usurping his father's throne, on the instigation of his wife Paūmāvaī (Padmāvatī),[1] demanded from his younger brothers the return of both gifts. On the latter refusing to give them up and flying with them to their grandfather Cheṭaka in Vaiśālī, Kūṇiya, having failed peacefully to obtain the extradition of the fugitives, commenced war with Cheṭaka.[2] According to Buddhaghosha's commentary the *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*,[3] the cause of the war was a breach of trust on the part of the Lichchhavis in connection with a mine of precious gems or some fragrant material near a port on the Ganges over which a condominium was exercised by Ajātaśatru and his northern neighbours.

The preliminaries to the struggle between Magadha and Vaiśālī are described in several Pāli texts.[4] In the *Mahāvagga* it is related that Sunīd(t)ha and Vassakāra, two ministers of Magadha, were building a fort at Pāṭaligrāma in order to repel the Vajjis (Vṛijis). The *Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta* says: "The Blessed One was once dwelling in Rājagaha on the hill called the Vulture's Peak. Now at that time Ajātasattu Vedehiputta, the king of Magadha, was desirous of attacking the Vajjians; and he said to himself, 'I will root out these Vajjians, mighty and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin' ".

"So he spake to the Brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the prime minister of Magadha, and said, 'Come now, Brāhmaṇa, do you go to the Blessed One, and ..tell him that Ajātasattu . has resolved, 'I will root out these Vajjians'. Vassakāra

[1] The appellation Padmāvatī is of so frequent occurrence in connection with Magadhan royalty that it seems to be an epithet rather than a personal name The mother of prince Abhaya, a queen of Ajātaśatru, and a sister of Darśaka, all have this name according to tradition *Cf*. the name Padminī applied to the most commendable type of women in treatises on Erotics It is also not improbable that the name belongs to the domain of mythology

[2] *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, II Appendix, p 7, cf Tawney, *Kathākośa*, pp 176ff

[3] Burmese Edition, Part II, p 99. See now B C Law, *Buddhistic Studies*, p. 199; *DPPN*, II, 781

[4] *SBE*, XI, pp. 1-5; XVII 101, *Gradual Sayings*, IV, 14 etc

hearkened to the words of the king..." (and delivered to the Buddha the message even as the king had commanded).

In the *Nirayāvalī Sūtra* (*Nirayāvaliyā Sutta*) it is related that when Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) prepared to attack Cheṭaka of Vaiśālī the latter called together the eighteen *Gaṇarājas*[1] of Kāśi and Kosala, together with the Lichchhavis and Mallakis, and asked them whether they would satisfy Kūṇika's demands, or go to war with him. The good relations subsisting between Kosala and Vaiśālī are referred to in the *Majjhima Nikāya*.[2] There is thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Jaina statement regarding the alliance between Kāśi-Kosala on the one hand and Vaiśālī on the other. It seems that all the enemies of Ajātaśatru including the rulers of Kāśi-Kosala and Vaiśālī offered a combined resistance. The Kosalan war and the Vajjian war were probably not isolated events but parts of a common movement directed against the establishment of the hegemony of Magadha. The flames fused together into one big conflagration.[3] We are reminded of the tussle of the Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls with the rising power of Rome.

In the war with Vaiśālī Kūṇiya-Ajātaśatru is said to have made use of the *Mahāsilākantaga* and *ra(t)hamusala*. The first seems to have been some engine of war of the nature of catapult which threw big stones. The second was a chariot to which a mace was attached and which, running about, effected a great execution of men.[4] The *ra(t)hamusala* may be compared to the tanks used in the great world wars.

The war is said to have synchronised with the death of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta, the great teacher of the Ājīvika sect. Sixteen years later at the time of Mahāvīra's death the anti-Magadhan confederacy is said to have been still

[1] Chiefs of republican clans. Cf. 125 *ante*.

[2] Vol. II, p. 101.

[3] We are told that even Pradyota of Avanti made preparations to avenge the death of his friend Bimbisāra (*DPPN*, I. 34).

[4] *Uvāsaga-dasāo*, Vol. II, Appendix, p. 60; *Kathākośa*, p. 179

in existence. We learn from the *Kalpa Sūtra* that on the death of Mahāvīra the confederate kings mentioned in the *Nirayāvalī Sūtra* instituted a festival to be held in memory of that event.[1] The struggle between the Magadhan king and the powers arrayed against him thus seems to have been protracted for more than sixteen years. The *Aṭṭhakathā* gives an account of the Machiavellian tactics[2] adopted by Magadhan statesmen headed by Vassakāra to sow the seeds of dissension among the Vaiśālians and thus bring about their downfall.[3]

[1] S.B.E., XXII, 266 (para. 128). As pointed out by Jacobi (*The Kalpasutra of Bhadravāhu*, 6 ff.) the traditional date of Mahāvīra's *Nirvāṇa* is 470 years before Vikrama (58 B.C.) according to the *Svetāmbaras*, and 605 according to the *Digambaras*. It is suggested that Vikrama of the Digambaras is intended for Śālivāhana (78 A.D.). A different tradition is, however, recorded by Hemachandra who says that 155 years after the liberation of Mahāvīra Chandragupta became king:—

evam cha śrī-Mahāvīra mukter varshaśate gate
pañchapañchāśadadhike Chandragupto'bhavan nripah.
—*Sthavirāvalīcharita, Pariśishṭaparva, VIII. 339.*

As Chandragupta's accession apparently took place between 326 and 312 B.C., the tradition recorded in Hemachandra's *Pariśishṭaparvan* would place the date of Mahāvīra's death between 481 and 467 B.C. But early Buddhist texts (*Dialogues*, III, pp. 111, 203; *Majjhima*, II, 243) make the famous Jaina teacher predecease the Buddha, and the latest date assigned by reliable tradition to the *Parinirvāṇa* of the Śākya sage is 486 B.C. (Cantonese tradition, Smith, EHI, 4th ed., 49) According to Ceylonese writers, Śākyamuni entered into *nirvāṇa* in the eighth year of Ajātaśatru (*Ajātasattuno vasse aṭṭhame muni nibbute*, *Mahāvaṃśa*, Ch. II). This would place the accession of the son of Bimbisāra in 493 B.C., if the Cantonese date for the *nirvāṇa* of the Buddha is accepted. Jaina writers put the interval between Kūṇika's accession and the death of their master at 16 and 'x' years. According to Buddhist chroniclers the interval would be less than 8 years as Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha. The divergent data of the Jaina and Buddhist texts can only be reconciled if we assume that the former take as their starting point the date of the accession of Kūṇika as the *rājā* of Champā, while the Buddhists begin their calculation from a later date when Ajātaśatru mounted the throne of Rājagṛiha. According to Buddhist tradition Vassakāra's visit to the Buddha in connection with the Vrijian incident took place a year before the *parinirvāṇa*. The destruction of the Vṛiji power took place some three years later on (*DPPN*, I. 33-34) *i.e.* c. 484 B.C. Too much reliance cannot, however, be placed on the traditional chronology.

[2] Diplomacy (*upalāpana*) and disunion (*mithubheda*), *DPPN*, II. 846. *JRAS*, 1931. Cf. *Gradual Sayings*, IV. 12. "The Vajjians cannot be overcome in battle, but only by cunning, by breaking up their alliance."

[3] Cf. *Modern Review*, July, 1919, pp. 55-56. According to the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-Mūla-Kalpa* (Vol. I. ed. Ganapati Śāstrī, pp. 603 f) the dominions of Ajātaśatru embraced, besides Magadha, Aṅga, Vārāṇasī (Benares), and

The absorption of Vaiśālī and a part at least of Kāsi as a result of the Kosalan and Vajjian wars probably brought the aspiring ruler of Magadha face to face with the equally ambitious sovereign of Avanti. We have already referred to a statement of the *Majjhima Nikāya* that on one occasion Ajātaśatru was fortifying his capital because he was afraid of an invasion of his dominions by Pradyota. We do not know whether the attack was ever made. Ajātaśatru does not appear to have succeeded in humbling Avanti. The conquest of that kingdom was reserved for his successors.

It was during the reign of Ajātaśatru that both Mahāvīra and Gautama, the great teachers of Jainism and Buddhism respectively, are said to have entered *nirvāṇa*. Shortly after the death of Gautama a Council is said to have been held by the monks of his Order for the recitation and collection of the Doctrine.

SECTION VI. AJĀTAŚATRU'S SUCCESSORS—THE TRANSFER OF CAPITAL AND THE FALL OF AVANTI

Ajātaśatru was succeeded according to the *Purāṇas* by Darśaka. Geiger considers the insertion of Darśaka after Ajātaśatru to be an error, because the Pāli Canon indubitably asserts that Udāyi-bhadda was the son of Ajātaśatru and probably also his successor. Jaina tradition recorded in the *Kathākośa*[1] and the *Pariśishṭaparvan*[2] also represents Udaya or Udāyin as the son of Kūṇika by his wife Padmāvatī,[3] and his immediate successor.

Though the existence of Darśaka, as a ruler of Magadha and a contemporary of Udayana, is rendered probable by references in the *Svapna-Vāsavadatta* attributed to Bhāsa, yet in the face of Buddhist and Jaina evidence it

Vaiśālī in the north. In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal the Parkham statue is a contemporary portrait of king Ajātaśatru But Kūṇika of Parkham (Luders List No 150) is obviously not a king.

[1] P. 177.

[2] P. 42.

[3] Buddhist writers represent Vajirā daughter of Prasenajit, as the mother of Udāyi.

cannot be confidently asserted that he was the immediate successor of Ajātaśatru on the imperial throne of Magadha. He may have been one of the *maṇḍalika rājās* like the father of Viśākha Pāñchālīputra. His inclusion among Magadhan suzerains is possibly paralleled by that of Śuddhodana in the main list of the Ikshvākuids. Certain writers identify him with Nāga-Dāsaka who is represented by the Ceylonese Chronicles as the last king of Bimbisāra's line.[1] The *Divyāvadāna*,[2] however, omits this name altogether from the list of the Bimbisārids. There was thus no unanimity even among Buddhists about the lineage and position of the king.

Udāyin: Before his accession to the throne Udāyin or Udāyi-bhadda, the son of Ajātaśatru, seems to have acted as his father's Viceroy at Champā.[3] The *Pariśishṭaparvan* informs us that he founded a new capital on the banks of the Ganges which came to be known as Pāṭaliputra.[4] This part of the Jaina tradition is confirmed by the testimony of the *Gārgī Saṃhitā*[5] and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* according to which Udāyin built the city of Kusumapura (Pāṭaliputra) in the fourth year of his reign. The choice of the place was probably due to its position in the centre of the realm which now included North Bihār. Moreover, its situation at the confluence of two large rivers, the Ganges and the Śoṇ and close to other streams, was important from the commercial as well as the strategic point of view. In this connection it is interesting to note that the

[1] *E.g.*, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar In this connection mention was made, in earlier editions, of a passage in the *Si-yu ki*, (Beal's Trans. II. p 102) "To the south-west of the old *Sanghārāma* about 100 li is the *Sanghārāma* of Ti-lo-shi-kia . . It was built by the last descendant of Bimbisāra rāja" The name of the second *Sanghārāma* was sought to be connected with that of Darśaka who was here represented as the last descendant of Bimbisara. But I now think that the connection of the monastery with the name of Darśaka is extremely doubtful. See Watters, II. p. 106f.

[2] P. 369.

[3] Jacobi, *Pariśishṭaparvan*, p. 42.

[4] VI. 34; 175-180.

[5] Kern, *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*, 36.

Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra recommends a site at the confluence of rivers for the capital of a kingdom.

The *Pariśishṭaparvan*[1] refers to the king of Avanti as the enemy of Udāyin. This does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that his father had to fortify his capital in expectation of an attack about to be made by Pradyota, ruler of that country. The fall of Aṅga and Vaiśālī and the discomfiture of Kosala had left Avanti the only important rival of Magadha. This last kingdom had absorbed all the monarchies and republics of Eastern India. On the other hand, if the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* and the *Āvaśyaka kathānakas*[2] are to be believed, the kingdom of Kauśāmbī was at this time annexed to the realm of Pālaka of Avanti, the son of Pradyota and was governed by a prince belonging to his family. The two kingdoms, Magadha and Avanti, were brought face to face with each other. The war of nerves between the two for ascendancy probably began, as we have seen, in the reign of Ajātaśatru. It must have continued during the reign of Udāyin.[3] The issue was finally decided in the time of

[1] Pp. 45-46, Text VI, 191. *Abhūdasahanontyam Avantiśo' py-Udāyinah*

[2] See *Supra* Sec. III. p. 204.

[3] For a traditional account of the conflict between Udāyin and the king of Avanti, see IHQ, 1929, 399.

In the opinion of Dr. Jayaswal one of the famous "Patna Statues" which, at the time of the controversy, stood in the Bhārhut Gallery of the Indian Museum (*Ind Ant.*, 1919, pp. 29ff.), is a portrait of Udāyin. According to him the statue bears the following words

Bhage ACHO chhonidhiśe.

He identifies *ACHO* with king Aja mentioned in the *Bhāgavata* list of Saiśunāga kings, and with Udāyin of the *Matsya, Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* lists Dr. Jayaswal's reading and interpretation of the inscription have not, however, been accepted by several scholars including Dr. Barnett, Mr. Chanda and Dr R C. Majumdar Dr Smith, however, while unwilling to dogmatize, was of opinion that the statue was pre Maurya In the third edition of his *Aśoka* he considers Dr. Jayaswal's theory as probable The characters of the short inscription on the statue are so difficult to read that it is well-nigh impossible to come to a final decision For the present the problem must be regarded as not yet definitely solved. Cunningham described the statue as that of a *Yaksha.* According to him the figure bore the words "*Yakhe Achusanigika*". Mr. Chanda's reading is *Bha*(?) *ga Achachha nivika* (the owner of inexhaustible capital, *i.e.*, Vaiśravaṇa). See *Indian Antiquary*, March, 1919. Dr Majumdar reads: *Gate (Yakhe?) Lechchhai* (*vi*) *40.4* (*Ind Ant.*, 1919).

Śiśunāga, or of Nanda as Jaina tradition seems to suggest.[1]

Udāyin's successors in the *Purāṇas* are Nandivardhana and Mahānandin. According to the Jainas he left no heir.[2] The Ceylonese chroniclers place after Udāyi the kings named Anuruddha, Muṇḍa and Nāga-Dāsaka. This tradition is partially confirmed by the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* which alludes to Muṇḍa,[3] King of Pāṭaliputra. The *Divyāvadāna*, too, mentions Muṇḍa but omits the names of Anuruddha and Nāga-Dāsaka. The *Aṅguttara Nikāya* by mentioning Pāṭaliputra as the capital of Muṇḍa indirectly confirms the tradition regarding the transfer of the Magadhan metropolis from Rājagṛiha to Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra before his reign.

The great Ceylonese chronicle avers that all the kings from Ajātaśatru to Nāga-Dāsaka were parricides.[4] The citizens drove out the family in anger and raised an *amātya* (official) to the throne.

Śusunāga or Śiśunāga, the new king[5] seems to have been acting as the Magadhan Viceroy at Benares. The employment of *amātyas* as provincial governors or district officers need not cause surprise. The custom continued as late as the time of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and Rudradāman I. The *Purāṇas* tell us that "placing his son at Benares he will repair to (the stronghold of) Girivraja". He had a second royal residence at Vaiśālī which ultimately became his capital.[6] "That monarch (Śiśunāga), not unmindful of

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, II 362

[2] *Pariśishṭaparvan*, VI. 236.

[3] *Ang.* III. 57. "The venerable Narada dwelt near Pāṭaliputta in the Cock's Park. Now at that time Bhaddā, the dear and beloved queen of king Muṇḍa died" The king's grief was intense. The queen's body was placed in an oil vessel made of iron. A treasurer, Piyaka, is also mentioned. (*Gradual Sayings*, III. 48).

[4] The violent death of Kūṇika (Ajātaśatru) is known to Jain tradition (Jacobi, *Pariśishṭaparvan*, 2nd ed. p. xiii).

[5] The question of the relative merits of Purāṇic and Ceylonese accounts of this king and his place in early Magadhan lists of kings have been discussed in Part I, pp. *supra*, 115 ff.

[6] SBE, XI, p. xvi If the *Dvātriṁśat-puttalikā* is to be believed Vesālī (Vaiśālī) continued to be a secondary capital till the time of the Nandas

his mother's origin,[1] re-established the city of Vesālī (Vaiśālī) and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagaha (Rājagṛiha-Girivraja) lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered".

The most important achievement of Śiśunāga seems to have been the destruction of the 'glory' of the **Pradyota dynasty of Avanti.** Pradyota the first king of the line, had been succeeded, according to tradition, by his sons Gopāla and Pālaka after whom came Viśākha and Āryaka. The name of Gopāla is omitted in the *Purāṇas* with the possible exception of the *k* Vishṇu manuscript, where it finds mention instead of Pālaka.[2] The accession of the latter synchronised, according to Jaina accounts, with the passing away of Mahāvīra. He is reputed to have been a tyrant. Viśākha-bhūpa (*i.e.*, king Viśākha called Viśākha-yūpa in most Purānic texts) may have been a son of Pālaka.[3] The absence of any reference to this prince in non-Purāṇic accounts that have hitherto been available, may suggest that he ruled in some outlying district (Māhishmatī), or was set aside in favour of Āryaka who occupied the throne, as a result of a popular outbreak, almost immediately after the fall of Pālaka. The Purāṇas place after Āryaka or Ajaka a king named Nandivardhana, or Vartivardhana, and add that Śiśunāga will destroy the prestige of the Pradyotas and be king. Dr. Jayaswal identifies Ajaka and Nandivardhana of the Avanti list with Aja-Udāyin and Nandivardhana of the Purāṇic list of Śaiśunāga kings.

[1] Śisunāga, according to the *Mahāvaṁsaṭīkā* (Turnour's *Mahāvaṁsa*, xxxvii), was the son of a Lichchhavi rājā of Vaiśālī He was conceived by a *nagara-śobhinī* and brought up by an officer of State.

[2] Essay on Guṇādhya, 115; Gopāla and Pālaka find mention in the *Brihat Kathā*, *Svapna-Vāsavadattā*, *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa*, *Mṛichchhakaṭika*, etc A prince named Kumārasena is known to the *Harsha-charita*. According to the Nepalese *Brihatkathā* (cf *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, XIX 57) Gopāla succeeds *Mahāsena* (Pradyota) but abdicates in favour of his brother Pālaka Pālaka renounces the crown in favour of Avantivardhana, son of Gopāla. In the *Āvaśyaka Kathānakas (Pariśishṭaparvan*, 2nd ed. xii) Avantisena is mentioned as a grandson of Pālaka.

[3] *DKA*, 19. n29. The *Kalki Purāna* (1. 3. 32f.) mentions a king named Viśākha-yūpa who ruled at Māhiśmatī near the southern frontier of ancient Avanti

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, says that Āryaka or Ajaka was the son of Gopāla, the elder brother of Pālaka.[1] 'Nandivardhana' and 'Vartivardhana' are apparently corruptions of Avantivardhana, the name of a son of Pālaka according to the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*,[2] of Gopāla according to the Nepalese *Bṛhat-kathā*,[3] or possibly identical with Avantisena, a grandson of Pālaka according to the *Āvaśyaka Kathānakas*.[4] The Pradyota dynasty must have been humbled by Śiśunāga in the time of king Avantivardhana. The Magadhan victory was doubtless facilitated by the revolution that placed Āryaka, a ruler about whose origin there is hardly any unanimity, on the throne of Ujjain.

Śiśunāga[5] was succeeded according to the *Purāṇas* by his son **Kākavarṇa**, and according to the Ceylonese chronicles by his son **Kālāśoka.** Jacobi, Geiger and Bhandarkar agree that Kālāśoka, "the black Aśoka" and Kākavarṇa, "the crow-coloured" are one and the same individual. The conclusion accords with the evidence of the *Aśokāvadāna* which places Kākavarṇin *after* Muṇḍa, and does not

[1] *Carm Lec.*, 1918, 64f. But J. Sen rightly points out (*IHQ*, 1930, 699) that in the *Mṛchchhakatika* Āryaka is represented as a cow boy who was raised to the throne after the overthrow of the tyrant Pālaka.

[2] Tawney's translation, II. 485, Cf. *Camb Hist. Ind.*, I 311.

[3] *Essay on Gunāḍhya*, 115.

[4] *Pariśishtaparvan* 2nd ed. p. xii.

TRADITIONAL GENEALOGY OF THE PRADYOTAS

[5] The *Kāvya Mīmāṁsā* (3rd ed., p. 50) contains an interesting notice of this king and says that he prohibited the use of cerebrals in his harem.

mention Kālāśoka.[1] The new king already served his apprenticeship in the art of government possibly at Benares and in the district of Gayā. The two most important events of his reign are the meeting of the second Buddhist Council at Vaiśālī, and the final transfer of the capital to Pāṭaliputra.

Bāṇa in his *Harsha-charita*[2] gives a curious legend concerning his death. It is stated that Kākavarṇa Śaiśunāgi had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story about the tragic fate of this king is, as we shall see later on, confirmed by Greek evidence.

The traditional successors of Kālāśoka were his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously. Their names according to the *Mahābodhivaṁsa* were Bhadrasena, Koraṇḍavarṇa, Maṅgura, Sarvañjaha, Jālika, Ubhaka, Sañjaya, Koravya, Nandivardhana and Pañchamaka.[3]

Only one of these names, *viz.*, that of **Nandivardhana** occurs in the Purāṇic lists.[4] This prince attracted some attention in recent years. His name was read on a Patna statue[5] and in the famous Hāthigumphā inscription of

[1] *Divyāvadāna*, 369; Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, p. xli.

[2] K. P. Parab, 4th ed., 1918, p. 199.

[3] The *Divyāvadāna* (p. 369) gives a different list of the successors of Kākavarṇin: Sahālin, Tulakuchi, Mahāmaṇḍala and Prasenajit. After Prasenajit the crown went to Nanda.

[4] Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, 83.

[5] Dr. Jayaswal opined that the headless "Patna statue" which stood, at the time when he wrote, in the Bhārhut Gallery of the Indian Museum, was a portrait of this king. According to him the inscription on the statue runs as follows.—

Sapa (or Sava) khate Vaṭa Naṁdi.

He regarded *Vaṭa Naṁdi* as an abbreviation of Vartivardhana (the name of Nandivardhana in the *Vāyu* list) and Nandivardhana. Mr. R. D. Banerji in the June number of the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, 1919, said that there cannot be two opinions about the reading *Vaṭa Naṁdi*. Mr. Chanda, however, regarded the statue in question as an image of a *Yaksha* and read the inscription which it bore as follows:—

Yakha sa (?) vaṭa naṁdi.

Dr. Majumdar said that the inscription might be read as follows:—

Yakhe saṁ vajināṁ 70.

He placed the inscription in the second century A. D., and supported the *Yaksha* theory propounded by Cunningham and upheld by Mr. Chanda. He did not agree with those scholars who concluded that the statue was a portrait of a Śaiśunāga sovereign simply because there were some letters in the inscrip-

Khāravela. He was sought to be identified with Nandarāja of Khāravela's record on the strength of Kshemendra's reference to *Pūrvananda* (Nanda the Elder) who, we are told, should be distinguished from the *Navanandāḥ* or New (Later) Nandas, and taken to answer to a ruler of the group represented by Nandivardhana and Mahānandin of the *Purāṇas*.[1] In the works of Kshemendra and Somadeva, however, Pūravananda (*singular*) is distinguished, not from the *Navanandāḥ*, but from Yogananda (Pseudo-Nanda), the re-animated corpse of king Nanda.[2] The *Purāṇic* as well as the Ceylonese chroniclers know of the existence of only *one* Nanda *line* and agree with Jaina tradition in taking *nava* to mean *nine* (and not *new*).[3] They represent Nandivardhana as a king of the Śaiśunāga line—a dynasty which is sharply distinguished from the Nandas. The *Purāṇas* contain nothing to show that

tion under discussion which might be construed as a name of a Śaiśunāga king. Referring to Dr. Jayaswal's suggestion that the form *Vaṭa Namdi* was composed of two variant proper names (Vartivardhana and Namdivardhana)—he said that Chandragupta II was also known as Devagupta, and Vigrahapāla had a second name Śūrapāla, but who had ever heard of compound names like Chandra-Deva, or Deva-Chandra, and Śūra-Vigraha or Vigraha-Śūra? (*Ind. Ant*, 1919).

Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāstrī took Vaṭa Namdi to mean *Vratya* Namdi and said that the statue had most of the articles of dress as given by Kātyāyana to the *Vrātya Kshatriyas*. In the *Purāṇas* the *Śiśunāga* kings are mentioned as *Kshattrabandhus, i.e., Vrātya Kshatriyas* The Mahāmahopādhyāya thus inclined to the view of Dr. Jayaswal that the statue in question was a portrait of a Śaiśunāga king (*JBORS*., December, 1919).

Mr. Ordhendu Coomar Gangoly, on the other hand, regarded the statue as a *Yaksha* image, and drew our attention to the catalogue of Yakshas in the *Mahāmāyūrī* and the passage "*Nandī cha Vardhanas chaiva nagare Nandivardhane*" (*Modern Review*, October, 1919) Dr. Barnett was also not satisfied that the four syllables which might be read as *Vaṭa Namdi* mentioned the name of a Śaiśunāga king. Dr. Smith, however, in the third edition of his *Asoka* admitted the possibility of Dr Jayaswal's contention. We regard the problem as still unsolved. The data at our disposal are too scanty to warrant the conclusion that the inscription on the "Patna statue" mentions a Śaiśunāga king. The script seems to be late.

[1] Jayaswal (supported by R. D. Banerji); *The Oxford History of India*, Additions and Corrections; *JBORS*, 1918, 91.

[2] *Cf. Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, Durgāprasād and Parab's edition, p. 10.

[3] *Cf.* Jacobi, *Pariśishṭaparvan* VIII. 3; App. p. 2, '*Namdavamse Navamo Namdarāyā*.

Nandivardhana had anything to do with Kaliṅga.[1] On the contrary, we are distinctly told that when the Śaiśunāgas and their predecessors were reigning in Magadha 32 kings ruled in Kaliṅga synchronously. "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought 'all under his sole sway' and 'uprooted all *Kshatriyas*.' So we should identify Naṁdarāja of the Hāthigumphā inscription who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."

SECTION VII. CHRONOLOGY OF THE HARYANKA-ŚAIŚUNĀGA KINGS

There is considerable disagreement between the *Purāṇas* and the Ceylonese chronicles regarding the chronology of the kings of the Bimbisārian (or Haryaṅka) and Śaiśunāga dynasties. Even Smith and Pargiter are not disposed to accept all the dates given in the *Purāṇas*.[2] According to Ceylonese tradition Bimbisāra ruled for fifty-two years, Ajātaśatru for 32 years, Udāyī for 16 years, Anuruddha and Muṇḍa for 8 years, Nāga-Dāsaka for 24 years, Śīśunāga for 18 years, Kālāśoka for 28 years and Kālāśoka's sons for 22 years. Gautama Buddha died in the eighth year of Ajātaśatru,[3] *i.e.*, in the (52 + 8 =) 60th year (*i.e.*, a little more than 59 years) after the accession of Bimbisāra. The event happened in 544 B.C. according to a Ceylonese reckoning, and in 486 B.C. according to a Cantonese tradition of 489 A.D., based on a 'dotted record' brought to China by Saṁgha-bhadra. The date 544 B.C. can, however, hardly be reconciled with a *gāthā* transmitted in the

[1] Chanda, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. I, p. 11.

[2] Pargiter (*AIHT*, pp. 286-7) reads the *Matsya Purāṇa* as assigning the Śiśunāgas 163 years, and further reduces the number to 145 allowing an average of about 14½ years for each reign. He places the beginning of the Śiśunāgas (among whom he includes the Bimbisārids) in B.C. 567 and rejects (287n) the traditional figures for the reigns of Bimbisāra and his son. *Cf.* also Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, p. 68. 'A period of 363 years for ten consecutive reigns' *i.e.*, 36.3 years for each 'is quite preposterous.'

[3] *Mahāvaṁsa*, Ch. 2 (p. 12 of translation).

Ceylonese chronicles which states that Priyadarśana (Aśoka Maurya) was consecrated 218 years after the Buddha had passed into *nirvāṇa*.[1] This fact and certain Chinese and Chola synchronisms led Geiger and a few other scholars to think that the era of 544 B.C. is a comparatively modern fabrication and that the true date of the death of the Buddha is 483 B.C.[2]—a result closely approaching that to which the Cantonese tradition leads us. The Chola synchronisms referred to by these scholars are, however, not free from difficulties, and it has been pointed out by Geiger himself that the account in Chinese annals of an embassy which Mahānāman, king of Ceylon, sent to the emperor of China in 428 A.D., does not speak in favour of his revised chronology. The traditional date of Menander which is *c.* 500 A.B., works out more satisfactorily with a *Nirvāṇa* era of 544 B.C., than with an era of 483 or 486 B.C. In regard to the Maurya period, however, calculations based on the traditional Ceylonese reckoning will place the accession of Chandragupta Maurya in 544 − 162 = 382 B.C., and the coronation of Aśoka Maurya in 544 − 218 = 326 B.C. These results are at variance with the evidence of Greek writers and the testimony of the inscriptions of Aśoka himself. Classical writers represent Chandragupta as a contemporary of Alexander (326 B.C.) and of Seleukos (312 B.C.). Aśoka in his thirteenth Rock Edict speaks of certain Hellenistic kings as alive. As one at least of these rulers died not later than 258 B.C. (250 B.C. according to some authorities) and as rescripts on morality began to be written when Aśoka was anointed twelve years, his consecration could not have taken place after 269 B.C. (261 B.C. according to some). The date cannot be pushed back beyond 277 B.C., because his grandfather Chandragupta must have ascended the throne after 326 B.C., as he met Alexander in that year as an

[1] *Dve satāni cha vassāni aṭṭhārasa vassāni cha*
Saṁbuddhe parinibbute abhisitto Piyadassano.
Ibid., p. xxiii (Cf. Dīp. 6. 1).

[2] *Ibid.*, Geiger, trans. p. xxviii; *JRAS*, 1909, pp. 1-34

ordinary individual and died after a reign of 24 years, and the next king Bindusāra, the father and immediate predecessor of Aśoka, ruled for at least 25 years. 326 B.C.—49 = 277 B.C., Aśoka's coronation, therefore, took place between 277 and 261 B.C., and as the event happened, according to the old *Gāthā* recorded by the Ceylonese Chroniclers, 218 years after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, the date of the Great Decease should be placed between 495 and 479 B.C. The result accords not with the Ceylonese date 544 B.C., but with the Cantonese date 486 B.C., and Geiger's date 483 B.C., for the *parinirvāṇa*. The Chinese account of embassies which King Meghavarṇa sent to Samudra Gupta, and King Kia-Che (Kassapa) sent to China in 527 A.D., also speaks in favour of the date 486 B.C., or 483 B.C., for the Great Decease. Geiger's date, however, is not recognised by reliable tradition. The same remark applies to the date (Tuesday, 1 April, 478 B.C.) preferred by L. D. Swami Kannu Pillai.[1] The Cantonese date may, therefore, be accepted as a working hypothesis for the determination of the chronology of the *early* dynasties of Magadha. The date of Bimbisāra's accession, according to this reckoning, would fall in or about 486 + 59 = 545 B.C., which is very near to the starting point of the traditional Ceylonese *Nirvāṇa* era of 544 B.C. 'The current name of an era is no proof of origins.' It is not altogether improbable that the Buddhist reckoning of Ceylon originally started from the coronation of Bimbisāra and was later on confounded with the era of the Great Decease.

In the time of Bimbisāra Gandhāra was an independent kingdom ruled by a king named Paushkarasārin (Pukkusāti). By B.C. 519 at the latest it had lost its independence and had become subject to Persia, as we learn from the inscriptions of Darius. It is thus clear that Paushkarasārin and his contemporary Bimbisāra lived before B.C. 519. This accords with the chronology

[1] *An Indian Ephemeris*, I, Pt. 1, 1922, pp. 471 ff.

which places his accession and coronation in or about B.C. 545-44.

SUGGESTED CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

(APPROXIMATE DATES)

Year B.C.	Event
565	Birth of the Buddha.
560	Birth of Bimbisāra.
c. 558	Accession of Cyrus the Achaemenid.
545-44	Accession of Bimbisāra. Epoch of a Ceylonese Era.
536	The Great Renunciation (of the Buddha).
530	Enlightenment.
530-29	The Buddha's visit to Bimbisāra.
527	Traditional Epoch of the era of Mahāvīra's *Nirvāṇa*
522	Accession of Darius I.
493	Accession of Ajātaśatru.
486	Cantonese date of the *Parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. The death of Darius I. Council of Rājagriha.
461	Accession of Udāyibhadraka
457	Foundation of Pāṭaliputra (Kusumapura).
445	Aniruddha (Anuruddha) and Huṇḍa
437	Nāga-Dāsaka (omitted in the *Divyāvadāna* and Jaina texts).
413	Śiśunāga.
395	Kālāśoka (Kākavarṇa).
386	Council of Vaiśālī.
367	Sons of Kālāśoka, and *de facto* rule of Mahāpadma Nanda.
345	End of the Śaiśunāga dynasty.

SECTION VIII. THE NANDAS

The Śaiśunāga dynasty was supplanted by the line of Nanda.[1] With the new family we reach a stage of East

[1] According to Jaina tradition Nanda was proclaimed king after Udāyin's assassination, and sixty years after the *Nirvāṇa* of Varddhamāna (*Pariśishṭa*, p VI. 243). For Nanda's history see now *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, pp. 9-26. N. Sastri, Raychaudhuri and others.

Indian history when the indubitable evidence of inscriptions becomes available to supplement the information gleaned from traditional literary sources. The famous Hāthigumphā record of Khāravela, of the second or first century B.C., twice mentions Naṁda-rāja in connection with Kaliṅga.

Paṁchame cedāni vase Naṁdarāja-ti-vasa-sata-oghāṭitaṁ
Tanasuliya-vāṭā panāḍi (ṁ) nagaraṁ pavesa (yati)......

"And then, in the fifth year (Khāravela) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda three hundred years[1] back to be brought into the capital from the Tanasuliya road."

Again, in connection with the twelfth year of Khāravela's reign, we have a reference to *Nadarāja-jita Kaliṁga-jana-saṁ(ni)i(ve)saṁ* (or, according to another reading, *Naṁda-rājanītaṁ Kaliṅga-Jina-saṁnivesaṁ*),[2] *i.e.*, a station

[1] This interpretation of '*tivasasata*' accords substantially with the Purāṇic tradition, regarding the interval between the Nandas and the dynasty to which Śātakarṇi, the contemporary of Khāravela in his second regnal year, belonged (137 years for the Mauryas + 112 for the 'Śuṅgas' + 45 for the Kāṇvas=294) If the expression is taken to mean 103 years (as is suggested by some scholars), Khāravela's accession must be placed 103−5=98 years after Nandarāja His elevation to the position of *Yuvarāja* took place 9 years before that date, *i.e.*, 98−9=89 years after Nanda, *i.e.*, not later than 324−89=235 B.C. Khāravela's senior partner in the royal office was on the throne at that time and he may have had his predecessor or predecessors. But we learn from Aśoka's inscriptions that Kalinga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya *Kumāra* (and not by a Kalinga-*adhipati* or *Chakravartī*) under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore, *tivasasata* should be understood to mean 300 and not 103 years. S. Konow (*Acta Orientalia*, I 22-26) takes the figure to express not the interval between Nanda and Khāravela, but a date *during the reign of* Nanda which was reckoned from some pre-existing era. But the use of any such era in the particular country and epoch is not proved Khāravela himself, like Aśoka, uses regnal years. The agreement with Purāṇic tradition speaks in favour of the view adopted in these pages.

[2] Barua, *Hāthigumphā Inscription of Khāravela* (*IHQ*, XIV. 1938, pp 259ff). *Sannivesa* is explained in the dictionaries as an assemblage, station, seat, open space near a town, etc. (Monier Williams). A commentator takes it to mean 'a halting place of caravans or processions'. Kuṇḍagrāma was a *sannivesa* in Videha (*SBE*, XXII. *Jaina Sūtras*, pt. I, Intro.). The reference in the inscription to the conquest of a place, or removal of a sacred object *from* Kalinga by Nandarāja disposes of the view that he was a local chief (*Camb Hist.*, 538).

or encampment, or a Jaina shrine, in Kaliṅga acquired[1] by king Nanda.

The epigraphs, though valuable as early notices of a line known mainly from literature, are not contemporaneous. For contemporary reports we must turn to Greek writers. There is an interesting reference, in the *Cyropaedia*[2] of Xenophon, who died some time after 355 B.C., to "the Indian king, a very wealthy man". This cannot fail to remind one of the Nandas whom the unanimous testimony of Sanskrit, Tamil, Ceylonese and Chinese writers describe as the possessors of enormous wealth.[3] Clearer information about the ruling family of Magadha (c. 326 B.C.) is supplied by the contemporaries of Alexander whose writings form the bases of the accounts of Curtius, Diodoros and Plutarch. Unfortunately, the classical writers do not mention the family name 'Nanda'. The reading 'Nandrum' in the place of 'Alexandrum' in the account of Justin is absolutely unjustifiable.

[1] Dr Barua (*op. cit.*, p 276n) objects to a Nanda conquest (or domination) of any part of Kaliṅga on the ground that the province "had remained unconquered (*avijita*) till the 7th year of Aśoka's reign". But the claim of the Maurya secretariat is on a par with Jahāngir's boast that "not one of the Sultans of lofty dignity has obtained the victory over it" (*i.e.*, Kangra, Rogers, *Tūzuk*, II. 184). Kalingas appear in the Purāṇas among the contemporaries of the Śaiśunagas who were overpowered by Nanda, the *Sarva-Kshatrāntaka*

[2] III. ii 25 (trans. by Walter Miller).

[3] *Cf.* the names Mahāpadmapati and Dhana Nanda The *Mudrārākshasa* refers to the Nandas as '*navanavatiśatadravyakoṭiśvarāḥ*' (Act III, verse 27), and '*Artharuchi*' (Act I)

A passage of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* says that King Nanda possessed 990 millions of gold pieces. Tawney's Translation, Vol. I, p. 21.

Dr. Aiyangar points out that a Tamil poem contains an interesting statement regarding the wealth of the Nandas "which having accumulated first in Pāṭali hid itself in the floods of the Ganges." *Beginnings of South Indian History*, p. 89. For N. Sastri's views see *ANM.*, pp. 253ff.

According to Ceylonese tradition "The youngest brother (among the sons of Ugrasena) was called Dhana Nanda, from his being addicted to hoarding treasure. . . He collected riches to the amount of eighty *koṭis*—in a rock in the bed of the river (Ganges) having caused a great excavation to be made, he buried the treasure there...Levying taxes among other articles even on skins, gums, trees and stones he amassed further treasures which he disposed of similarly" (Turnour, *Mahāvaṁsa*, p. xxxix).

Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese pilgrim, refers to "the five treasures of King Nanda's seven precious substances".

For a detailed account of the dynasty we have to rely on Indian tradition. Indian writers seem to be mainly interested in the Nanda age partly as marking an epoch in a social upsurge and the evolution of imperial unity, and partly as accessory to the life-sketch of Jaina patriarchs and to the *Chandragupta-kathā* of which we have fragments in the *Milindapañho, Mahāvaṁsa*, the Purāṇic chronicles, the *Bṛihat-Kathā* and its later versions together with the *Mudrā-rākshasa* and the *Arthaśāstra* compendiums.

The first Nanda was **Mahāpadma** or Mahāpadmapati[1] according to the *Purāṇas* and **Ugrasena** according to the *Mahābodhivaṁsa*. The *Purāṇas* describe him as a son of the last *Kshatrabandhu* (so-called Kshatriya) king of the preceding line by a Śūdrā mother (*Śūdrā-garbh-odbhava*). The Jaina *Pariśishṭaparvan*,[2] on the other hand, represents Nanda as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Jaina tradition is strikingly confirmed by the classical account of the pedigree of Alexander's Magadhan contemporary who was the predecessor of Chandragupta Maurya.[3] Referring to this prince (Agrammes) Curtius says, "His **father** was in fact a **barber**, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who from his being not uncomely in person, had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign, and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, **usurped the supreme authority,** and having put the young princes to death, begot the present king."

The barber ancestry of Agrammes, recorded by the classical writers is quite in keeping with the Jaina story of the extraction of the Nanda line. That the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander and of young Chandragupta

[1] 'Sovereign of an infinite host' or 'of immense wealth' according to the commentator (Wilson, *Vishṇu P.*, Vol. IX. 184n.). A city on the Ganges, styled Mahāpadmapura, is mentioned in *Mbh.*, XII. 353. 1.

[2] P. 46. Text VI. 231-32.

[3] McCrindle, *The Invasion of India by Alexander*, p. 222.

was a Nanda king is not disputed. The real difficulty is about his identity. He could not possibly have been the *first* Nanda himself. The words used in reference to Agrammes, "the present king," *i.e.*, Alexander's contemporary in Curtius' narrative, make this point clear. He (Agrammes) was *born in purple* to one who had *already "usurped supreme authority"* having secured the affections of a *queen*. That description is scarcely applicable to the *founder* of the dynasty who was, according to Jaina testimony, the son of an ordinary courtesan (*gaṇikā*) by a barber apparently without any pretensions to *supreme power in the state*.

The murdered sovereign seems to have been Kālāśoka-Kāl avarṇa who had a tragic end as we learn from the *Harsha-charita*. Kākavarṇa Śaiśunāgi, says Bāṇa, had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The young princes referred to by Curtius were evidently the sons of Kālāśoka-Kākavarṇa. The Greek account of the rise of the family of Agrammes fits in well with the Ceylonese account of the end of the Śaiśunāga line and the rise of the Nandas, but not with the Purāṇic story which represents the first Nanda as a son of the last Śaiśunāga by a Śūdra woman, and makes no mention of the young princes. The name Agrammes is probably a distorted form of the Sanskrit Augrasainya, "son of Ugrasena".[1] Ugrasena is, as we have seen, the name of the first Nanda according to the *Mahābodhivaṁsa*. His son may aptly be termed Augrasainya which the Greeks corrupted into Agrammes and later on into Xandrames.[2]

[1] "Augrasainya" as a royal patronymic is met with in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, viii. 21.

[2] The identification of Xandrames (taken to answer to Sanskrit Chandramas) the Magadhan contemporary of Alexander, with Chandragupta, proposed by certain writers, is clearly untenable. Plutarch (*Life of Alexander*, Ch 62) clearly distinguishes between the two, and his account receives confirmation from that of Justin (Watson's tr., p. 142). Xandrames or Agrammes was the *son of a usurper* born after his father had become king of the Prasii, while Chandragupta was himself the founder of a new sovereignty, the first king of his line. The father of Xandrames was a barber who could claim no royal ancestry. On the other hand, Brāhmaṇical and Buddhist writers are un-

The *Purāṇas* call Mahāpadma, the first Nanda king, the destroyer of all the Kshatriyas (*sarva Kshatrāntaka*) and the sole monarch (*ekarāṭ*) of the earth which was under his undisputed sway, which terms imply that he finally overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Śaiśunāgas, *viz.*, the Ikshvākus, Pañchālas, Kāśis, Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aśmakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Śūrasenas, Vītihotras,[1] etc. The Jainas, too, allude to the wide dominion of Nanda.[2] The Indian account of the unification of a considerable portion of India under Nanda's sceptre is corroborated by several

animous in representing Chandragupta as a descendant of a race of rulers, though they differ in regard to the identity of the family and its claim to be regarded as of pure Kshatriya stock. Jaina evidence clearly suggests that the barber usurper is identical with the *Nāpitakumāra* or *Nāpitasū* (*Pariśishṭa*, VI. 231 and 244) who founded the Nanda line

[1] Conquest of *some* of the territories occupied by the tribes and clans named here by former kings of Magadha does not necessarily mean the total extinction of the old ruling families, but merely a deprivation of their glory (*yaśah*) and an extension of the suzerainty of the conqueror. Extirpation cannot be meant unless it is definitely asserted as in the case of Mahāpadma Nanda's conquest, or that of Samudra Gupta in Āryāvarta. It may also sometimes be implied by the appointment of a prince of the conquering family as viceroy Allowance, however, must be made for a good deal of exaggeration. Even the Vajjians were not literally 'rooted out' by Ajātaśatru, as the most important of the constituent clans, *viz.*, the Lichchhavis, survive till the Gupta Age A branch of the Ikshvākus may have been driven southwards as they are found in the third or fourth century A.D. in the lower valley of the Kṛishṇā The Kāśis overthrown by Nanda may have been the descendants or successors of the prince whom Śiśunāga had placed in Benares. The Haihayas occupied a part of the Narmadā valley. Conquest of a part of Kaliṅga by Nanda is suggested by the Hāthigumphā record, that of Aśmaka and part of the Godāvarī valley by the city called 'Nau Nand Dehra' (Nander, Macauliffe, *Sikh Religion*, V. p. 236). Vītihotra sovereignty had terminated before the rise of the Pradyotas of Avanti. But if the Purāṇic statement (*DKA*. 23, 69) "Contemporaneously with the aforesaid kings (Śaiśunāgas, etc.) there will be.. ....Vītihotras" has any value, the Śaiśunāgas may have paved the way for a restoration of some scion of the old line in Avanti. According to the evidence of the *Purāṇas* (*Vāyu*, 94. 51-52) the Vītihotras were one of the five *gaṇas* of the Haihayas, and the survival of the latter is well attested by epigraphic evidence. The Maithilas apparently occupied a small district to the north of the Vajjian dominions annexed by Ajātaśatru. The Pañchālas, Kurus, and the Śūrasenas occupied the Gangetic Doāb and Mathurā and the control of their territories by the king of Magadha, c. 326 B.C., accords with Greek evidence.

[2] *Samudravasanebhya ās mudramapiaśriyaḥ*
upāya hastairākṛishya tataḥ so' krita Nandasāt
Pariśishṭa Parvan, VII. 81

classical writers who speak of the most powerful peoples who dwelt beyond the 'extensive deserts' (apparently of Rājputāna and some adjoining tracts) in the time of Alexander, *viz.*, the Prasii (*Prāchyas*) and the Gangaridae (people of the lower Ganges Valley) as being under one sovereign who had his capital at Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra).[1] Pliny informs us[2] that the Prasii surpass in power and glory every other people in all India, their capital being Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra), after which some call the people itself Palibothri, nay, even the whole tract of the Ganges. The author is referring probably to conditions in the time of the Mauryas, and not in that of the Nandas. But the greatness that the Prasii (*i.e.* the Magadhans and some other eastern peoples) attained in the Maurya Age would hardly have been possible but for the achievements of their predecessors of which we have a record by the historians of Alexander. The inclusion of the Ikshvāku territory of Kosala within Nanda's dominions seems to be implied by a passage of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*[3] which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhyā. Several Mysore inscriptions state that Kuntala, a province which included the southern part of the Bombay Presidency and the north of Mysore, was ruled by the Nandas.[4] But these are of comparatively modern date, the twelfth century, and too much cannot be built upon their statements. More important is the evidence of the Hāthigumphā inscription which mentions the constructive activity of Nandarāja in Kaliṅga and his conquest (or removal) of some place (or sacred object) in that country. In view of Nanda's control over parts of Kaliṅga, the conquest of Aśmaka and other regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable. The existence on the Godāvarī of a city called

[1] *Inv. Alex.*, 221, 281; *Megasthenes and Arrian* by McCrindle (1926), pp. 671, 141, 161.

[2] *Megasthenes and Arrian* (1926), p. 141.

[3] Tawney's Translation, p. 21.

[4] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 3; Fleet, *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, 284, n. 2.

"Nau Nand Dehra" (Nander)[1] also suggests that the Nanda dominions may have embraced a considerable portion of the Deccan.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* assigns 88 years to the reign of the first Nanda, but 88 (*Ashṭāśīti*) is probably a mistake for 28 (*Ashṭāviṁśati*), as the *Vāyu* assigns only 28 years. According to Tāranāth Nanda reigned 29 years.[2] The Ceylonese accounts inform us that the Nandas ruled only for 22 years. The Purāṇic figure 28 is probably to be taken to include the period when Nanda was the *de facto* ruler of Magadha before his final usurpation of the throne.

Mahāpadma-Ugrasena was succeeded by his eight sons who were possibly kings in succession. They ruled for twelve years according to the Purāṇas The Ceylonese Chronicles, as we have already seen, give the total length of the reign-period of all the nine Nandas as 22 years. The Purāṇas specify the name of one son of Mahāpadma, *viz.*, Sukalpa.[3] The *Mahābodhivaṁsa* gives the following names: Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Bhūtapāla, Rāshṭrapāla, Govishāṇaka, Daśasiddhaka, Kaivarta and **Dhana**. The last king is possibly identical with the **Agrammes** or **Xandrames** of the classical writers Agrammes is, as we have seen, probably a distortion by the Greeks of the Sanskrit patronymic *Augrasainya*.

The first Nanda left to his sons not only a big empire but also a large army and, if tradition is to be believed, a full exchequer and an efficient system of civil government. Curtius tells us that Agrammes, king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, kept in the field for guarding the approaches to his country 20,000 cavalry and 200,000

[1] Macauliffe's *Sikh Religion*, V p 236

[2] *Ind Ant.*, 1875, p 362.

[3] The name has variants. One of these is Sahalya Dr. Barua makes the plausible suggestion that the prince in question may be identical with Sahalin of the *Divyāvadāna* (p 369, Pargiter, DKA 25n 24; *Bauddha Dharma Kosha*, 44). The evidence of that Buddhist work in regard to the relationship between Sahalin and Kākavarṇa can, however, hardly be accepted. The work often errs in this respect. It makes Pushyamitra a lineal descendant of Aśoka (p. 433).

infantry, besides 2,000 four-horsed chariots, and what was the most formidable force of all, a troop of elephants which, he said, ran up to the number of 3,000. Diodoros and Plutarch give similar accounts. But they raise the number of elephants to 4,000 and 6,000 respectively. The name of one of the generals, Bhaddasāla is preserved by Buddhist tradition.[1]

The immense riches of the Nandas have already been referred to. The family may also be credited with irrigation projects in Kaliṅga and the invention of a particular kind of measure (*Nandopakramāṇi mānāni*).[2] The existence of a body of capable ministers is vouched for both by Brāhmaṇical and Jaina tradition. But in the end they proved no match for another traditional figure whose name is indissolubly linked up with the fall of the Nandas and the rise of a more illustrious race of rulers.

No detailed account of this great dynastic revolution has survived. The accumulation of an enormous amount of wealth by the Nanda kings probably implies a good deal of financial extortion. Moreover, we are told by the classical writers that Agrammes (the Nanda contemporary of Alexander) "was detested and held cheap by his subjects as he rather took after his father than conducted himself as the occupant of a throne."[3]

The Purāṇic passage about the revolution[4] stands as follows:

Uddharishyati tān sarvān
Kauṭlyo vai dvijarshabhaḥ

[1] *Milinda Pañho*, SBE. xxxvi. pp. 147-8.

[2] S. C. Vasu's trans. of the *Ashtādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, rule illustrating *sūtra* II 4, 21.

[3] McCrindle, *The Invasion of India by Alexander*, p. 222. *Cf* Ref to Nanda's avarice and parentage *DKA.*, 125, Jaina *Pariśishṭa parvan*, vi. 244.—
tataścha kechit sāmantā madenāndhaṁ bhavishṇavaḥ
Nandasya na natiṁ chakrurasau nāpitasūriti.

[4] The dynastic change is also referred to by the *Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra*, the *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra*, the *Mudrārākshasa*, the *Chaṇḍa Kauśika*, the Ceylonese Chronicles, etc.

Kauṭilyaś-Chandraguptaṁ tu
tato rājye bhishekshyati.[1]

The *Milinda-Pañho*[2] refers to an episode of the great struggle between the Nandas and the Mauryas: "There was Bhaddasāla, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, and he waged war against king Chandagutta. Now in that war, Nāgasena, there were eighty Corpse dances. For they say that when one great Head Holocaust has taken place (by which is meant the slaughter of ten thousand elephants, and a lac of horses and five thousand charioteers, and a hundred *koṭis* of soldiers on foot), then the headless corpses arise and dance in frenzy over the battle-field." The passage contains a good deal of mythical embellishment. But we have here a reminiscence of the bloody encounter between the contending forces of the Nandas and the Mauryas.[3]

[1] Some Mss. read *dvirashṭabhih* in place of *dvijarshamhaḥ*. Dr. Jayaswal (*Ind. Ant.*, 1914, 124) proposed to emend it to *Virashṭrābhiḥ*. *Virashtrās* he took to mean the Āraṭṭas and added that Kauṭilya was helped by the Ārāṭṭas "the band of robbers" of Justin. *Cf.* Cunningham, *Bhilsa Topes*, pp. 88, 89. Pargiter, however, suggests, (*Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 26. 35) that *dvija-rṣabhaḥ* (the best among the twice-born, *i.e.*, Brāhmaṇas) may be the correct reading instead of "*dvirashtabhiḥ*".

[2] IV. 8. 26. Cf. *SBE.*, xxxvi. pp. 147-48

[3] Cf. *Ind. Ant*, 1914, p. 124n.

CHAPTER III. THE PERSIAN AND MACEDONIAN INVASIONS

SECTION I. THE ADVANCE OF PERSIA TO THE INDUS.

While the kingdoms and republics of the Indian interior were gradually being merged in the Magadhan Empire, those of North-West India (including modern Western Pākistān) were passing through vicissitudes of a different kind. In the first half of the sixth century B.C., the *Uttarāpatha* (northern region) beyond the *Madhyadeśa* (Mid-India, roughly the Ganges-Jumna Doāb, Oudh and some adjoining tracts), like the rest of India, was parcelled out into a number of small states the most important of which were Kamboja, Gandhāra and Madra. No sovereign arose in this part of India capable of welding together the warring communities, as Ugrasena-Mahāpadma had done in the East. The whole region was at once wealthy and disunited, and formed the natural prey of the strong Achaemenian monarchy which grew up in Persia (Irān).

Kurush or **Cyrus** (558-530 B.C.[1]) the founder of the Persian Empire, is said to have led an expedition against India through Gedrosia, but had to abandon the enterprise, escaping with seven men only.[2] But he was more successful in the Kābul valley. We learn from Pliny that he destroyed the famous city of Kāpiśī, at or near the confluence of the Ghorband and the Panjshir. Arrian informs us[3] that "the district west of the river Indus as far as the river Cophen (Kābul) is inhabited by the Astacenians (Āshṭakas)[4] and the Assacenian (Aśvakas), *Indian* tribes.

[1] 550-529 B.C. according to *A Survey of Persian Art*, p. 64.
[2] H. and F., *Strabo*, III. p 74.
[3] Chinnock, *Arrian's Anabasis*, p. 399.
[4] Patañjali (IV. 2. 2) refers to "*Āshṭakaṁ nāma dhanva;*" (*cf* *Hashtnagar*, and *Aṭhakanagara*, Lüders, 390).

These were in ancient times subject to the Assyrians, afterwards to the Medes, and finally they submitted to the Persians, and paid tribute to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, as ruler of their land." Strabo tells us that on one occasion the Persians summoned the Hydraces (the Kshudrakas) from India (*i.e.*, the Pañjāb) to attend them as mercenaries.

In the Behistun or Bahistān Inscription of Dārayavaush or **Darius I** (*c.* 522-486 B.C.) the third sovereign of the Achaemenian dynasty, the people of Gandhāra (Gadāra) appear among the subject peoples of the Persian Empire. But no mention is there made of the Hidus (Hindus, people of Sindhu or the Indus Valley) who are explicitly referred to in the Hamadan Inscription, and are included with the Gandhārians in the lists of subject peoples given by the inscriptions on the terrace at Persepolis, and around the tomb of Darius at Naqsh-i-Rustum.[1] From this it has been inferred that the "Indians" (Hidus) were conquered at some date between 519 B.C. (the probable date of the Behistun or Bahistān inscription),[2] and 513 B.C.[3] The preliminaries to this conquest are described by Herodotus:[4] "He (Darius, being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Scylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out

[1] *Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidan Inscriptions* by H. C. Tolman; Rapson, *Ancient India;* Herzfeld, *MASI*, 34, pp. 1 ff. For contact between the Medes and India, see *India Antiqua*, 1947, 180ff.

[2] In the opinion of Jackson (*Camb. Hist. India*, I, 334) the Bahistān Rock Inscription is presumably to be assigned to a period between 520 and 518 B.C. with the exception of the fifth column, which was added later. Rapson regarded 516 B.C. as the probable date of the famous epigraph while Herzfeld prefers the date 519 B.C. (*MASI*, No. 34, p. 2).

[3] Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, 145. Herzfeld is, however, of the opinion that reference to the 'Thatagush' in early Persian epigraphs shows that (part of) the Pañjāb, like Gandhāra, was Persian from the days of Cyrus the Great. (Satrapy of Hindus was formed before 513 B.C., Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 145. Some scholars believe that the conquest of Sind *preceded* Scylax's exploration of the Indus—*India Antiqua*, p. 181).

[4] McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, pp. 4-5.

from the city of Caspatyrus[1] and the country of Paktyike (Pakthas?)[2] sailed down the river towards the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westwards, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented the Sea."

Herodotus tells us that "India" constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian Empire, and that it paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest,—360 talents of gold dust, equivalent to £1,290,000 of the pre-war period. There is no reason to believe that all this gold came from Bactria or Siberia. Gold deposits are not unknown in several tracts of the North-West Frontier and quantities of gold are recovered from the alluvium of rivers. A small quantity of the precious metal used to be imported by Bhotiya traders from the Tibetan Hills.[3] Gandhāra was at first included in the seventh satrapy. The details regarding "India" left by Herodotus leave no room for doubt that it embraced the Indus Valley and was bounded on the east by the desert of Rājaputāna.[4] "That part of India towards the rising sun is all sand; for of the people with whom we are acquainted, the Indians live the furthest towards the east and the sunrise, of all the inhabitants of

[1] *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I. 336. The city was probably situated in ancient Gandhāra; Herod. IV. 44.

[2] *Camb. Ibid*, 82, 339 Paktyike is apparently the ancient name of the modern Pathan country on the north-west borderland of the sub-continent of India.

[3] Crooke, *The North-Western Provinces of India*, 1897, p. 10; *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 19-7-39, p. 6; *cf.* Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, I. 225, 239.

[4] There is no reason to believe that the Indian satrapy of Darius refers to Sind or to some small territory to the *west* of the Indus. The account of Herodotus III. 94-98 seems to suggest that it extended eastwards beyond the Beas as far as the river Sarasvatī which flowed past the *Marudhanvan* in the days of the *Mahābhārata* (see 22n 2 *ante*; *cf.*, desert beyond the Beas, ANM, p. 16) and finally disappeared in the sands of Rājputāna. "Eastward of India lies a tract which is entirely sand . . . the Indians dwell nearest to the east, and the rising of the Sun. Beyond these the whole country is desert on account of the sand." The Sattagydians, the Gandarians, the Dadicæ and the Aparytae, constituted the seventh satrapy and the Indians the twentieth (Herod. III. 91-94).

Asia, for the Indians' country towards the east is a desert by reason of the sands." Curtius refers to extensive deserts beyond the Beas.

The organisation of the empire into *Satrapies* served as a model to several succeeding dynasties, and was given a wider extension in India by the Śakas and the Kushāns in the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. The *Deśa-goptṛi* of the Gupta Age was the lineal successor of the Satrap (*Kshatra-pāvan*) of earlier epochs.

The Persian conquerors did much to promote geographical exploration and commercial activity. At the same time they took from the country not only an enormous amount of gold and other commodities such as ivory and wood, but denuded it of a great portion of its man-power. Military service was exacted from several tribes. Contact between the East and the West became more intimate with important results in the domain of culture. If the Achaemenians brought the Indian bowmen and lancers to Hellenic soil, they also showed the way of conquest and cultural penetration to the peoples of Greece and Macedon.

Khshayārshā or **Xerxes** (486-465 B.C.), the son and successor of Darius I, maintained his hold on the Indian provinces. In the great army which he led against Hellas both Gandhāra and "India" were represented. The Gandhārians are described by Herodotus as bearing bows of reed and short spears, and the "Indians" as being clad in cotton garments and bearing cane bows with arrows tipped with iron. One of the newly discovered stone-tablets at Persepolis[1] records that Xerxes "by Ahuramazda's will" sapped the foundations of certain temples of the *Daivas* and ordained that "the *Daivas* shall not be worshipped". Where the *Daivas* had been worshipped, the king worshipped Ahuramazda together with *Ṛtam* (divine world order). 'India' may have been among the lands which

[1] *The Illustrated London News*, Feb. 22, 1936, p. 328 Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, 152.

witnessed the outcome of the religious zeal of the Persian king.

The Persian Empire rapidly declined after the death of Xerxes. But if Ktesias who resided at the Court of Artaxerxes II, Mnemon 405-358 B.C., is to be believed, the Great King used to receive costly presents from India even in the fourth century B. C.[1] The South Tomb Inscription at Persepolis,[2] usually assigned to Artaxerxes II, continues to mention the Sattagydians, the Gandharians and the Hi(n)dus side by side with the Persians, the Medians, the Susians and others apparently as subjects of the Achaemenian King.

Among interesting relics of Persian dominion in India mention is sometimes made of a Taxila Inscription in Armaic characters of the fourth or fifth century B.C.[3] But Herzfeld points out[4] that the form *Priyadarśana* occurs in the record which should be referred to the reign of Aśoka, and not to the period of Persian rule. To the Persians is also attributed the introduction of the *Kharoshṭhī* alphabet, the "Persepolitan capital" and words like *"dipi"* (rescript) and *"nipishṭa"* ("written") occurring in the inscriptions of Aśoka. Persian influence has also been traced in the preamble of the Aśokan edicts.

SECTION II. THE LAST OF THE ACHAEMENIDS AND ALEXANDER

Artaxerxes II died in or about 358 B.C. After a period of weak rule and confusion, the crown went to Darius III Codomannus (335-330 B.C.). This was the king against whom Alexander, the great king of Macedon, led forth his famous phalanx. After several engagements in which the Persian forces suffered repeated defeats, the Macedonian conqueror rode on the tracks of his vanquish-

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X (1881), pp. 304-310.
[2] S. Sen, *Old Persian Inscriptions*, 172f.
[3] *JRAS*, 1915, I. pp. 340-347.
[4] *Ep. Ind.*, XIX, 253.

ed enemy and reached the plain watered by the river Bumodus.

Three distinct groups of Indians figured in the army which mustered under the banner of the Persian monarch in that region. "The *Indians who were conterminous with the Bactrians* as also the Bactrians themselves and the Sogdianians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the Viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius . . . Barsaentes, the Viceroy of Arachotia, led the Arachotians and the men who were called *Mountaineer Indians*. There were a few elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the *Indians who live this side of the Indus*. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela."[1] The hold of the Achaemenians on the Indians in the various provinces on the frontier had, however, grown very feeble about this time, and the whole of north-western India was parcelled out into innumerable kingdoms, hyparchies and republics. A list of the more important among these is given below:—

1. The **Aspasian** territory (Alishang-Kūnar-Bajaur valley):

It lay in the difficult hill country north of the Kābul river watered by the Khoes, possibly the modern Alishang, and the Euaspla, apparently the Kūnar. The name of the people is derived from the Irānian "*Aspa*," *i.e.*, the Sanskrit "*Aśva*" (horse) or *Aśvaka*. The Aspasians were thus the western branch of the Aśvakas (Assakenians).[2] The chieftain, *hyparch*, of the tribe dwelt in a city on or near the river Euaspla, supposed to be identical with the Kūnar, a tributary of the Kābul. Other Aspasian cities were Andaka and Arigaeum.[3]

[1] Chinnock, *Arrian's Anabasis*, pp. 142-143.
[2] *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, 352. n. 3, *Cf. assānam āyatanam*, 1494 *ante*.
[3] Chinnock's *Arrian*, pp. 230-231.

2. The country of the **Guraeans:**

It was watered by the river Guraeus, **Gauri,** or Pañjkora, and lay between the land of the Aspasians and the country of the Assakenians.

3. The Kingdom of **Assakenos** (part of Swat and Buner):

It stretched eastwards as far as the Indus and had its capital at Massaga, a "formidable fortress probably situated not very far to the north of the Malakand Pass but not yet precisely identified." The name of the Assakenians probably represents the Sanskrit **Aśvaka** 'land of horses,' not **Aśmaka,** 'land of stone.' The territory occupied by the tribe was also known in different ages as Suvāstu, Udyāna and, according to some, Oḍḍiyāna. The Aśvakas do not appear to be mentioned by Pāṇini unless we regard them as belonging to the same stock as the Aśmakas[1] of the south for which there is no real ground. They are placed in the north-west by the authors of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* and the *Bṛhat Saṁhitā.* The Assakenian king had a powerful army of 20,000 cavalry, more than 30,000 infantry and 30 elephants. The reigning king at the time of Alexander's invasion is called by the Greeks Assakenos. His mother was Kleophis. Assakenos had a brother[2] who is called Eryx by Curtius and Aphrikes by Diodoros.[3] There is no reason to believe that these personages had any relationship with king Śarabha, whose tragic fate is described by Bāṇa and who belonged apparently to the southern realm of the Aśmakas in the valley of the Godāvarī.

4. **Nysa :**

This was a small hill-state which lay at the foot of Mt. Meros between the Kophen or Kābul river and the

[1] IV. I. 173.

[2] *Invasion of Alexander,* p. 378.

[3] He led the flying defenders of the famous fortress of Aornos against the Greeks (*Camb. Hist. Ind.,* I. 356). Aornos is identified by Sir Aurel Stein with the height of Una between the Swat and the Indus (*Alexander's Campaign on the Frontier, Benares Hindu University Magazine,* Jan., 1927). The southern side of the stronghold was washed by the Indus. (*Inv. Alex.,* 271).

Indus.[1] It had a republican constitution. The city was alleged to have been founded by Greek colonists long before the invasion of Alexander.[2] Arrian says,[3] "The Nysaeans are not an Indian race, but descended from the men who came to India with Dionysus." Curiously enough, a *Yona* or Greek state is mentioned along with Kamboja in the *Majjhima Nikāya*[4] as flourishing in the time of Gautama Buddha and Assalāyana: "*Yona Kambojesu dveva vaṇṇā Ayyo c'eva Dāsoca* (there are only two social grades among the Yonas and the Kambojas, *viz.*, Aryan and Dāsa)."

According to Holdich the lower spurs and valleys of Kohi-Mor in the **Swat** country are where the ancient city of Nysa once stood.[5] At the time of Alexander's invasion the Nysaens had Akouphis for their President. They had a Governing Body of 300 members.[6]

5. **Peukelaotis** (in the Peshāwar District):

It lay on the road from Kābul to the Indus. Arrian tells us[7] that the Kābul falls into the Indus in the land called Peukelaotis, taking with itself the Malantus, Soastus and Guraeus. Peukelaotis represents the Sanskrit **Pushkarāvatī**. It formed the western part of the old kingdom of Gandhāra. The people of the surrounding region are sometimes referred to as the "Astakenoi" by historians. The capital is represented by the modern Mīr Ziyārat and Chārsadda, about 17 miles N. E. of Peshāwar, on the Swat river, the Soastus of Arrian, and the Suvāstu of the Vedic texts.

The reigning *hyparch* at the time of Alexander's invasion was Astes[8] identified with Hastī or Ashṭaka. He

[1] *Inv Alex*, 79, 193.

[2] McCrindle, *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 79; Hamilton and Falconer. *Strabo*. Vol III, p. 76. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal informed me that he referred to the Nysaean Indo-Greeks in a lecture delivered as early as 1919.

[3] Chinnock's *Arrian*, p. 399.

[4] II. 149.

[5] Smith, *EHI*, 4th ed., p. 57. *Camb. Hist.*, I. p. 353.

[6] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 81.

[7] Chinnock's *Arrian's Anabasis of Alexander and Indica*, p. 403.

[8] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 228.

was defeated and killed by Hephaestion, a general of the Macedonian king.

6. **Taxila** or Takshaśilā (in the Rāwalpindi District):

Strabo says[1] "between the Indus and the Hydaspes (Jhelum) was Taxila, a large city, and governed by good laws. The neighbouring country is crowded with inhabitants and very fertile." The kingdom of Taxila formed the eastern part of the old Kingdom of Gandhāra.

In B. C. 327 the Taxilian throne was occupied by a *hyparch*, or *basileus*, whom the Greeks called Taxiles. When Alexander of Macedon arrived in the Kābul valley he sent a herald to the king of Taxila to bid him come and meet him. Taxiles accordingly did come to meet the conqueror, bringing valuable gifts. When he died his son Mophis or Omphis (Sanskrit Āmbhi) succeeded to the government. Curiously enough, the reputed author of the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, himself a native of Taxila according to the *Mahāvaṁsa Ṭikā*, refers to a school of political philosophers called Āmbhīyas, and Dr. F. W. Thomas connects them with Taxilā.[2]

7. The kingdom of **Arsakes:**

The name of the principality represents the Sanskrit **Uraśā** which formed part of the modern **Hazāra** District. It adjoined the realm of Abisares, and was probably, like the latter, an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Uraśā is mentioned in several *Kharoshṭhī* inscriptions, and, in the time of the geographer Ptolemy, absorbed the neighbouring realm of Taxilā.

8. **Abhisāra:**

Strabo observes[3] that the kingdom was situated among the mountains *above* the Taxilā country. The position of this state was correctly defined by Stein who pointed out that *Dārvābhisāra*[4] included the whole tract of the lower and middle hills lying between the Jhelum and the Chenāb.

[1] H. and F's. tr., III, p. 90.
[2] *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra. Introduction*, p. 15.
[3] H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 90.
[4] Cf. *Mbh.*, VII. 91, 43.

Roughly speaking, it corresponded to the Punch and some adjoining districts in Kaśmīra with a part at least of the Hazāra District of the North-West Frontier Province. It was probably an offshoot of the old kingdom of Kamboja. Abisares, the contemporary of Alexander, was a shrewd politician of the type of Charles Emanuel III of Sardinia. When the Macedonian invader arrived in Taxila he informed him that he was ready to surrender himself and the land which he ruled. And yet before the battle which was fought between Alexander and the famous Poros, Abisares intended to join his forces with those of the latter.[1]

9 The **kingdom of the Elder Poros** :

This territory lay between the Jhelum and the Chenāb and roughly corresponded to parts of the modern districts of **Guzrāṭ and Shāhpur.**[2] Strabo tells us[3] that it was an extensive and fertile district containing nearly 300 cities. Diodoros informs us[4] that Poros had an army of more than 50,000 foot, about 3,000 horses, above 1,000 chariots, and 130 elephants. He was in alliance with Embisaros, *i.e.*, the king of Abhisāra.

Poros probably represents the Sanskrit Pūru or **Paurava.** In the *Ṛg-Veda* the Pūrus are expressly mentioned as on the Sarasvati. In the time of Alexander, however, we find them on the Hydaspes (Jhelum). The *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*,[5] too, associates the 'Pauravas' with 'Madraka' and 'Mālava.' The *Mahābhārata*,[6] also, refers to a "*Puraṁ Paurava-rakshitam*", city protected by the Pauravas, which lay not far from Kaśmīra. It is suggested in the *Vedic Index*[7] that either the Hydaspes was the earlier home of the Pūrus, where some remained after the others had wandered east, or the later Pūrus represent a successful onslaught upon the west from the east.

[1] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 276. *Inv. Alex.*, 112.
[2] It apparently included the old territory of Kekaya.
[3] H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 91.
[4] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 274.
[5] XIV. 27.
[6] II. 27, 15-17.
[7] Vol. II, pp. 12-13.

10. The country of the people called **Glauganikai** (Glauganicians) by Aristobulus, and Glausians by Ptolemy:[1]

This tract lay to the west of the Chenāb and was conterminous with the dominion of Poros.[2] It included no less than seven and thirty cities, the smallest of which had not fewer than 5,000 inhabitants, while many contained upwards of 10,000.

11. **Gandaris** (in the Rechna Doāb):

This little kingdom lay between the Chenāb and the Rāvi and (if Strabo has given the correct name of the territory) probably represented the easternmost part of the old *Mahājanapada* of Gandhāra.[3] It was ruled by the Younger Poros, nephew of the monarch who ruled the country between the Jhelum and the Chenāb.

12. The **Adraistai** (in the Bari Doāb):[4]

They dwelt on the eastern side of the Hydraotes or the Rāvi, and their main stronghold was Pimprama.

13. **Kathaioi** or Cathaeans (probably also in the Bari Doāb):

Strabo points out[5] that "some writers place Cathaia and the country of Sopeithes, one of the *nomarchs*, in the tract between the rivers (Hydaspes and Acesines, *i.e.*, the Jhelum and the Chenāb); some on the other side of the Acesines and of the Hydarotis, *i.e.*, of the Chenāb and the Rāvi, on the confines of the territory of the other Poros, the nephew of Poros who was taken prisoner by Alexander." The Kathaioi probably represent the Sanskrit Kaṭha, Kāṭhaka,[6] Kantha[7] or Krātha.[8] They were the most emi-

[1] With the second part of the name *anīka*, troop or army, may be compared that of the Sanakānīkas of the Gupta period Dr Jayaswal, who, doubtless following Weber in *IA*, ii (1873), p. 147, prefers the restoration of the name as Glauchukāyanaka, does not apparently take note of this fact.

[2] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 276. *Inv. Alex.*, 112. The country was subsequently given to the elder Poros to rule.

[3] But see *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I, 370, n. 4; the actual name of the territory in olden times was, however, Madra.

[4] Adrijas? *Mbh.*, VII. 259. 5.

Yaudheyān Adrijān rājan Madrakān Mālavān api.

[5] H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 92.

[6] Idlly *SBE.*, VII. 15; *Ep. Ind.*, III. 8.

[7] *Cf.*, *Pāṇini*, II. 4. 20.

[8] *Mbh.*, VIII 85 16.

nent among the independent tribes dwelling in the area of which the principal centre was Sangala (Sāṅkala). This town was probably situated in the **Gurudāspur** district, not far from Fathgarh.[1] Anspach locates it at Jandiāla to the east of **Amritsar.**[2]

The Kathaians enjoyed the highest reputation for courage and skill in the art of war. Onesikritos tells us that in Kathaia the handsomest man was chosen as king.[3]

14. The **kingdom of Sophytes** (Saubhūti), probably along the banks of the Jhelum:

In the opinion of Smith, the position of this kingdom is fixed by the remark of Strabo[4] that it included a mountain composed of fossil salt sufficient for the whole of India; Sophytes was, therefore, according to him, the "lord of the fastness of the Salt Range stretching from the Jhelum to the Indus." But we have already seen that the classical writers agree in placing Sophytes' territory *east of the Jhelum.* Curtius tells us[5] that the nation ruled by Sopeithes (Sophytes), in the opinion of the "barbarians," excelled in wisdom, and lived under good laws and customs. They did not acknowledge and rear children according to the will of the parents, but as the officers entrusted with the medical inspection of infants might direct, for if they remarked anything deformed or defective in the limbs of a child they ordered it to be killed. In contracting marriages they did not seek an alliance with high birth but made their choice by the looks, for beauty in the children was highly appreciated. Strabo informs us[6] that the dogs in the territory of Sopeithes (Sophytes) were said to possess remarkable courage. We have some coins of Sophytes bearing on the obverse the head of the king, and on the reverse the figure of a cock.[7] According to Smith

[1] *JRAS.*, 1903, p. 687.
[2] *Camb. Hist Ind*, I. 371.
[3] McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, p. 38.
[4] H. & F.'s tr., III, p. 93.
[5] *Invasion of India by Alexander*, p. 219.
[6] H. & F., III, p. 93
[7] Whitehead (*Num Chron.*, 1943, pp 60-72) rejects the identification of

the style is suggested probably by the "owls" of Athens. Strabo calls Sophytes a *nomarch* which probably indicates that he was not an independent sovereign, but only a viceroy of some other king.[1]

15. The kingdom of **Phegelas** or Phegeus (in the Bari Doāb):

It lay between the Hydraotes (Rāvi) and the Hyphasis (Bias).[2] The name of the king, Phegelas, probably represents the Sanskrit *Bhagala*—the designation of a royal race of Kshatriyas mentioned in the *Gaṇapāṭha*.[3]

16. The **Siboi** (in the lower part of the Rechna Doāb):

They were the inhabitants of the Shorkot region in Jhang district below the junction of the Jhelum and the Chenāb.[4] They were probably identical with the Śiva people mentioned in a passage of the *Ṛig-Veda*[5] where they share with the Alinas, Pakthas, Bhalānases, and Viśāṇins the honour of being defeated by Sudās.[6] The *Jātakas* mention a Sivi country and its cities Ariṭṭhapura[7] and Jetuttara.[8] It is probable that Śiva, Śivi, Śibi, and Siboi were one and the same people. A place called Śiva-pura is mentioned by the scholiast on Pāṇini as situated in the northern country.[9] It is, doubtless, identical with Śibipura

Sophytes with Saubhūti. He thinks that "Saubhūti is a philologist's creation There is no historical evidence that Saubhūti existed" (p. 63). Subhūti (from which Saubhūti is apparently derived) is a fairly common name in Indian literature (The *Questions of King Milinda*, Part II, *SBE*. XXXVI, pp. 315, 323; Geiger, the *Mahāvaṁsa*., tr., 151n, 275.) It is by no means improbable that a Hindu Rajah should strike a piece bearing a Hellenized form of his name, as the Hinduised Scythian rulers did in later ages.

[1] Was it the Great King of W. Asia or some Indian potentate? Among other *nomarchs* mention may be made of Spitaces, a nephew and apparently a vassal of the elder Poros (*Camb Hist. Ind.*, 36, 365, 367).

[2] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 281, 401.

[3] *Invasion of Alexander* p. 401. *Cf. Kramadīśvara*, 769

[4] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 232.

[5] VII. 18. 7.

[6] *Vedic Index*, Vol. II, pp. 381-382. A 'Śaibya' is mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (VIII. 23; *Vedic Index*, 1 31).

[7] *Ummadanti Jātaka*, No. 527; *cf.* Pāṇini, VI. 2. 100.

[8] *Vessantara Jātaka*, No. 547. See also *ante*, p. 198, n 6.

[9] Patañjali, IV, 2. 2; *Ved. Ind.*, II, p. 382. *IHQ*, 1926, 758.

mentioned in a Shorkot inscription edited by Vogel. In the opinion of that scholar the mound of Shorkot marks the site of this city of the Śibis.[1]

The Siboi dressed themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and had clubs for their weapons.

The *Mahābhārata*[2] refers to a *rāshṭra* or realm of the Śivis ruled by king Uśînara, which lay not far from the Yamunā.[3] It is not altogether improbable that the Uśînara country[4] was at one time the home of the Śivis. We find them also in Sind, in Madyamikā (Tambavatī nagarī?) near Chitor in Rājputāna,[5] and in the *Daśa-kumāra-charita*, on the banks of the Kāverī.[6]

17. The **Agalassoi:**

This people lived near the Siboi, and could muster an army of 40,000 foot and 3,000 horse.

18. The Sudracae or **Oxydrakai:**

The accounts of Curtius and Diodoros[7] leave the impression that they lived not far from the Siboi and the Agalassoi, and occupied part of the territory below the confluence of the Jhelum and the Chenāb. At the confluence Alexander garrisoned a citadel and *thence* came into the dominions of the Sudracae and the Malli (Mālavas). The former may have occupied parts of the Jhang and Lyallpur districts. The name of the Sudracae or the Oxydrakai represents the Sanskrit **Kshudraka.**[8] They were one of the most numerous and warlike of all the Indian tribes in the Pañjāb. Arrian in one passage refers to the "leading men of their cities and their provincial governors" besides other eminent men. These words afford us

[1] *Ep Ind.*, 1921, p. 16.

[2] III. 130 131

[3] *Cf.* Siba (Cunn , *AGI.*, revised ed., pp. 160-161).

[4] *Vide* pp. 65, 66 *ante*.

[5] Vaidya *Med. Hind. Ind.*, 1, p. 162; *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, p. 173. Allan, *Coins of Anc. Ind.*, cxxiii.

[6] The southern Śivis are probably to be identified with the Chola ruling family (Kielhorn, *List of Southern Inscriptions*, No 685).

[7] *Inv. Alex.*, 233-4, 286-7.

[8] *Mbh.*, II. 52, 15; VII. 68.9.

a glimpse into the internal condition of this and similar tribes.

19. The **Malloi** :

They seem to have occupied the right bank of the lower Hydraotes (Rāvi) and are mentioned as escaping across that river to a city of the Brāhmaṇas. The Akesines (Chenāb) is said to have joined the Indus in their territory.[1] Their name represents the Sanskrit **Mālava.** According to Weber, Āpiśali (according to Jayaswal, Kātyāyana), speaks of the formation of the compound "*Kshaudraka-Mālavāḥ.*" Smith points out that the *Mahābhārata* couples the tribes in question as forming part of the Kaurava host in the Kurukshetra war.[2] Curtius tells us[3] that the Sudracae and the Malli had an army consisting of 90,000 foot soldiers, 10,000 cavalry and 900 war chariots.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar informs us that Pāṇini refers to the Mālavas as living by the profession of arms.[4] In later times they are found in Rājputāna, Avanti and the Mahī valley.

20. The **Abastanoi:**

Diodoros calls them the Sambastai,[5] Arrian Abastanoi, Curtius Sabracae, and Orosius Sabagrae. They were settled on the lower Akesines (Chenāb) apparently below the Mālava country, but above the confluence of the Chenāb and the Indus. Their name represents the Sanskrit *Āmbashṭha* or *Ambashṭha.*[6] The Ambashthas are mentioned in several Sanskrit and Pāli works. An Ām-

[1] *Megasthenes and Arrian* (2nd ed.), p. 196. The accuracy of this statement may be doubted. The Malloi territory seems to have included part of the Jhang district, besides a portion of South Lyallpur, West Montgomery, and perhaps North Multan.

[2] *EMI.*, 1914, p. 94n.; *Mbh.*, VI. 59. 135.

[3] *Invasion of Alexander*, 234.

[4] *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, p. 200.

[5] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 292.

[6] Dr. Surya Kānta draws a distinction between *Āmbashṭha* and *Ambashṭha* regarding the former as a place-name, and the latter as the name of a particular class of people, 'an elephant-driver, a Kshatriya, a mixed caste'. (*B.C. Law*, Vol. II, pp. 127ff). To us the distinction seems to be based upon philological conjectures.

bashṭha king is mentioned in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[1] whose priest was Nārada. The *Mahābhārata*[2] mentions the Ambashṭhas along with the Śivis, Kshudrakas, Mālavas and other north-western tribes. The Purāṇas represent them as Ānava Kshatriyas and kinsmen of the Śivis.[3] In the *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra*,[4] the Āmbashṭha country is mentioned in conjunction with Sind:

Kāśmīra-Hūn-Āmbashṭha-Sindhavaḥ.

In the *Ambaṭṭha Sutta*,[5] an Ambaṭṭha is called a Brāhmaṇa. In the *Smṛti* literature, on the other hand, Ambashṭha denotes a man of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya parentage. According to *Jātaka* IV. 363, the Ambaṭṭhas were farmers. It seems that the Ambashṭhas were a tribe or clan who were at first mainly a fighting race, but some of whom took to other occupations, *viz.*, those of priests, farmers and, according to *Smṛti* writers, physicians (*Ambashṭhānāṁ chikitsitam*).[6]

In the time of Alexander, the Ambashṭhas were a powerful tribe having a democratic government Their army consisted of 60,000 foot, 6,000 cavalry and 500 chariots.[7]

In later times the Ambashṭhas are found in South-Eastern India near the Mekala range, and also in Bihar and possibly in Bengal.[8]

[1] VIII. 21.

[2] II. 52. 14-15.

[3] Pargiter, *AIHT.*, pp. 108-109.

[4] Ed. F. W. Thomas, p. 21.

[5] *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part 1, p. 109.

[6] Manu. X. 47. Dr. Surya Kānta suggests the reading (*Law Volume*, II, 134) *cha hāstinam*. In his dissertation he speaks of the possibility of *Ambashṭha* being a Sanskritized form of a Celtic word meaning 'husbandman, tiller of the ground'. It is also pointed out that the word may be an exact parallel to '*mahāmātra*' inasmuch as '*ambhas*' means 'of large measure', 'an elephant', so that *Ambashṭha* would mean 'one sitting on the elephant', *i.e.*, a driver, a keeper, a *sāmanta*, or a *Kshatriya*. They lived on warfare, presumably as *gajārohas*, and banner-bearers.

A distinction is drawn between *Ambashṭha* and *Āmbashṭha*. The last mentioned expression is considered to be a place-name, based on the plant name Āmba. For other notes on the subject see Prabāsī, 1351 B. S; I, 206, *JUPHS.*, July-Dec., 1945. pp. 148 ff; *History of Bengal* (D. U.). pp. 568 ff.

[7] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 252.

[8] *Cf.* Ptolemy, *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, 361; *Brihat Saṁhitā*; XIV. 7; *Mekhalā*

21-22. The **Xathroi** and the **Ossadioi**

The Xathroi are according to McCrindle[1] the **Kshatri** of Sanskrit literature mentioned in the Laws of Manu as an impure tribe, being of mixed origin. V. de Saint-Martin suggests that in the Ossadioi we have the **Vasāti** of the *Mahābhārata*,[2] a tribe associated with the Śibis and Sindhu-Sauvīras of the Lower Indus Valley.[3] Like the Abastanoi, the Xathroi and the Ossadioi seem to have occupied parts of the territory drained by the lower Akesines (Chenāb) and situated between the confluence of that river with the Rāvi and the Indus respectively.

23-24. The **Sodrai** (sogdoi) and the **Massanoi** :

They occupied Northern Sind with contiguous portions of the Pañjāb (Mithan-koṭ area) and the Bahawalpur state, below the confluence of the Pañjāb rivers. The territories of these two tribes lay on opposite banks of the Indus. The Sodrai are the **Sūdra** tribe of Sanskrit literature, a people constantly associated with the Ābhiras who were settled near the Sarasvatī.[4] Their royal seat (*basileion*) stood on the Indus. Here another Alexandria was founded by the Macedonian conqueror.

mushṭa of *Mārkaṇḍeya P.*, LVIII. 14, is a corruption of *Mekal-Ambashṭha*. *Cf.* also the Ambashtha Kāyasthas of Bihār, the Gauḍa Ambashṭha of the *Surjan-Charita* (*DHNI.*, II 1061 n. 4) of the time of Akbar, and the Vaidyas of Bengal whom Bharata Mallika classes as Ambashṭha. This is not the place to discuss the authenticity or otherwise of the tradition recorded by Bharata and some of the Purāṇas. The origin of the *Vaidyas*, or of any other caste in Bengal, is a thorny problem which requires separate treatment. What the author aims at in these pages is to put some available evidence, early or late, about the Abastanoi. That *some* Ambashṭhas, and Brāhmaṇas too, took to the medical profession is clear from the evidence of Manu and Atri (*Saṁhitā*, 378) and Bopadev. It is equally clear that the Vaidya problem cannot be solved in the way it has been sought to be done in some recent publications. Due attention should be given to historical evidence bearing on the point like that of Megasthenes and of certain early Chalukya, Pāṇḍya, and other epigraphs, *e g.* the Talamanchi plates, *Ep. Ind.* IX. 101; Bhandarker's List 1371, 2061, etc.

[1] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 156 n.

[2] VII. 19. 11; 89. 37; VIII. 44. 99.

[3] "*Amhishṭhāḥ Śūrasenāḥ Śivayo'tha Vaśātayaḥ*" (*Mbh.*, VI 106 8)
"*Vaśāti Sindhu-Sauvīrā itiprāyo' tikutsitāḥ.*"
"*Gandhārāḥ Sindhu-Sauvīrāḥ Śivayo'tha Vaśātayaḥ*" (*Mbh.*, *VI.* 51 14).

[4] *Patañjali*, 1. 2. 3; *Mbh.*, VII. 19. 6; IX. 37. 1.

25. The kingdom of **Mousikanos:**

This famous state included a large part of modern Sind. Its capital has been identified with Alor in the **Sukkur** district. The characteristics of the inhabitants of the realm of Mousikanos as noticed by Strabo are given below :[1]

"The following are their peculiarities; to have a kind of Lacedæmonian common meal, where they eat in public. Their food consists of what is taken in the chase. They make no use of gold nor silver, although they have **mines of these metals.** Instead of slaves, they employed youths in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphamiotæ, and the Lacedæmonians the Helots. They study no science with attention but that of *medicine:*[3] for they consider the excessive pursuit of some arts, as that of war, and the like to be committing evil. There is no process at law but against murder and outrage, for it is not in a person's own power to escape either one or the other ; but as contracts are in the power of each individual, he must endure the wrong, if good faith is violated by another ; for a man should be cautious whom he trusts, and not disturb the city with constant disputes in courts of justice."

From the account left by Arrian it appears that the "Brachmans," *i.e.*, the Brāhmaṇas exercised considerable influence in the country. They were the instigators of a revolt against the Macedonian invadore.[4]

26. The principality of **Oxykanos:**

Curtius calls the subjects of Oxykanos the Praesti **(Proshthas?).**[5] Oxykanos himself is styled both by Strabo and Diodoros Portikanos. Cunningham places his terri-

[1] Bevan in *Camb. Hist. Ind*, p. 377, following Lassen (*Inv. Alex.*, 157 n) restores the name as Mūshika. Dr. Jayaswal in his *Hindu Polity* suggests Muchukarṇa. *Cf.* Maushikāra (*Patañjali*, IV. 1. 4).

[2] H. & F., III, p. 96.

[3] This trait they shared with the Ambashṭhas (*cf.* Manu, X. 47).

[4] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 319. *Cf.* Strabo, xv. i. 66,—"Nearchos says that the Brachmans engage in the affairs of the state and attend the king as councillors."

[5] *Mbh.*, VI. 9. 61.

tory to the west of the Indus in the level country around **Larkhāna.**[1]

27. The principality of **Sambos**:[2]

Sambos was the ruler of a *mountainous country* adjoining the kingdom of Mousikanos, with whom he was at feud. His capital, called Sindimana, has been identified, with little plausibility, with Sehwan, a city on the Indus.[3] According to Diodoros 'a city of the Brāhmaṇas' (Brāhmaṇavāṭa ?) had to be stormed whilst the operations against Sambos were going on.[4]

28. **Patalene:**

It was the Indus delta, and took its name from the capital city, Patala probably near the site of Bahmaṇābād.

Diodoros tells us[5] that Tauala (Patala) had a political constitution drawn on the same lines as the Spartan ; for in this community the command in war was vested in two hereditary kings of different houses, while a Council of Elders ruled the whole state with paramount authority. One of the kings in the time of Alexander was called **Moeres.**[6]

The states described above had little tendency to unity or combination. Curtius tells us[7] that Āmbhi, ruler of Taxila, was at war with Abisares and Poros. Arrian informs us that Poros and Abisares were not only enemies of Taxila but also of the neighbouring autonomous tribes. On one occasion the two kings marched against the Kshudrakas and the Mālavas.[8] Arrian further tells us that the relations between Poros and his nephew were far from friendly. Sambos and Mousikanos were also on hostile terms. Owing to these feuds and strifes amongst the petty states, a foreign invader had no united

[1] *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 158, *AGI.*, Revised ed. 300.

[2] Śambhu, according to Bevan (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, 377).Śāmba is a possible alternative.

[3] McCrindle, *Invasion of Alexander*, p. 404; *AGI.*, Revised ed., 302 f.

[4] Diod. XVII. 103. 1; *cf.* Alberuni (I. 316; II. 262).

[5] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 296.

[6] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 256, *cf.* Maurya.

[7] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 202.

[8] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 297.

resistance to fear; and he could be assured that many among the local chieftains would receive him with open arms out of hatred for their neighbours.

The Nandas of Magadha do not appear to have made any attempt to subjugate these states of the *Uttarāpatha* (North-West India). The task of reducing them was reserved for a foreign conqueror, *viz.*, Alexander of Macedon. The tale of **Alexander's conquest** has been told by many historians including Arrian, Q. Curtius Rufus, Diodoros Siculus, Plutarch and Justin. We learn from Curtius that Scythians and Dahae served in the Macedonian army.[1] The expedition led by Alexander was thus a combined Śaka-Yavana enterprise. The invader met with no such general confederacy of the native powers like the one formed by the East Indian states against Kūṇika-Ajātaśatru. On the contrary he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Taxila, Sangæus (Sañjaya ?) of Pushkarāvatī, Kophaios or Cophæus (of the Kābul region ?), Assagetes (Aśvajit ?), and Sisikottos (Śaśīgupta) who got as his reward the satrapy of the Assakenians.[2] The only princes or peoples who thought of combining against the invader were Poros and Abisares, and the Mālavas (Malloi), Kshudrakas (Oxydrakai), and the neighbouring autonomous tribes. Even in the latter case personal jealousies prevented any effective results. Alexander met with stubborn resistance from individual chiefs and clans, notably from Astes (Hastī or Ashṭaka ?), the Aspasians, the Assakenians, the elder Poros, the Kathaians, the Malloi, the Oxydrakai, and the Brāhmaṇas of the kingdom of Mousikanos. Massaga, the stronghold of the Assakenians, was stormed with great difficulty, Poros was defeated on the banks of the Hydaspes (B.C. 326), the Malloi and the Oxydrakai were also no doubt crushed. But Alexander found that his Indian antagonists were different from the effete troops of Persia. Diodoros informs us that at Massaga, where Alexander treacherously massacred the

[1] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 208.
[2] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 112.

mercenaries, "the women, taking the arms of the fallen, fought side by side with the men."[1] Poros, when he saw most of his forces scattered, his elephants lying dead or straying riderless, did not flee—as Darius Codomannus had twice fled—but remained fighting, seated on an elephant of commanding height, and received nine wounds before he was taken prisoner.[2] The Malloi almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. But all this was of no avail. A disunited people could not long resist the united forces of the Hellenic world led by the greatest captain of ancient Europe. Alexander succeeded in conquering the old Persian Provinces of Gandhāra and "India," but was unable to try conclusions with Agrammes king of the Gangaridae and the Prasii, *i.e.*, the last Nanda king of Magadha and the other Gangetic provinces in Eastern India. Plutarch informs us that the battle with Poros depressed the spirits of the Macedonians and made them very unwilling to advance further into India. Moreover, they were afraid of the "Gandaritai and the Praisiai" who were reported to be waiting for Alexander with an army of 80,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 8,000 war-chariots and 6,000 fighting elephants. As a matter of fact when Alexander was retreating through Karmania he received a report that his satrap Philippos, governor of the Upper Indus Province, had been murdered (324 B.C.). Shortly afterwards the Macedonian garrison was overpowered. The Macedonian governor of the Lower Indus satrapy had to be transferred to the north-west borderland beyond the Indus and no new satrap was appointed in his place. The successors of Alexander at the time of the Triparadeisos agreement in 321 B.C. confessed their inability to remove the Indian Rājās of the Pañjāb without royal troops under the command of some distinguished general. One of the Rājās, possibly Poros, was treacherously slain by Eudemos, an officer stationed in the Upper Indus satrapy. The withdrawal of the latter (*cir.* 317 B.C.) marks the

[1] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 270.

[2] *Cf.* Bury, *History of Greece for Beginners*, pp. 428-29.

ultimate collapse of the first serious attempt of the *Yavanas* to establish an empire in India.

The only permanent **effect of Alexander's raid** seems to have been the establishment of a number of *Yavana* settlements in the *Uttarāpatha*. The most important of these settlements were:

1. The city of Alexandria (modern Charikar or Opian?)[1] in the land of the Paropanisadae, *i.e.*, the Kābul region.

2. Boukephala,[2] possibly on the east side of the Hydaspes (Jhelum).

3. Nikaia[3], where the battle with Poros took place.

4. Alexandria at or near the confluence of the Chenāb and the Indus[4], to the north-east of the countries of the Sodrai, or Sogdoi, and Massanoi, and

5. Sogdian Alexandria,[5] below the confluence of the Pañjāb rivers.

Aśoka recognised the existence of Yona (Yavana) settlers on the north-western fringe of his empire, and appointed some of them, (*e.g., the* Yavana-rāja Tushāspha)[6] to high offices of state. Boukephala Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.*[7] One of the Alexandrias (Alasanda) is mentioned in the *Mahāvaṁsa.*[8]

[1] According to Tarn (*The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 1st. ed., 462) Alexandria stood on the west bank of the united Panjshir-Ghorband rivers near the confluence facing Kāpiśa on the east bank. It is represented by the modern Begram.

[2] Nikaia and Boukephala stood one on each side of the Jhelum. Tarn thinks (*Alexander the Great, Sources and Studies*, p. 236) that Boukephala stood on the east bank of the Jhelum and Nikaia on the west bank (*ibid* p. 238).

[3] The completion of Nikaia is doubted by Tarn (*Alexander the Great*, II, 238).

[4] The confluence of the Indus and the Akesines was fixed as the boundary of the Upper and Lower Indus satrapies.

[5] *Inv. Alex.*, pp. 293, 354; Bury, *History of Greece for Beginners*, p. 433; *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I. 376f.

[6] For the nationality of Tushāspha and significance of the term "Yavana" see Raychaudhuri, *Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect*, 2nd Ed., pp. 28f, 314 *post.*

[7] Schoff's tr., p. 41.

[8] Geiger's tr., p. 194.

Alexander's invasion produced one indirect result. It helped the cause of Indian unity by destroying the power of the petty states of north-west India, just as the Danish invasion contributed to the union of England under Wessex by destroying the independence of Northumbria and Mercia. If Ugrasena-Mahāpadma was the precursor of Chandragupta Maurya in the east, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.

CHAPTER IV. THE MAURYA EMPIRE : THE ERA OF DIGVIJAYA

SECTION I. THE REIGN OF CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA

Mlechchhairudvejyamānā bhujayugamadhunā
saṁśritā rājamūrteḥ
Sa śrīmadbandhubhṛtyaśchiramavatu mahīṁ
pārthivaś-Chandraguptaḥ.
—*Mudrārākshasa.*

In B.C. 326 the flood of Macedonian invasion had overwhelmed the Indian states of the Pañjāb, and was threatening to burst upon the *Madhyadeśa.* Agrammes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent towards the field of Tours. The question whether India was, or was not, to be Hellenized awaited decision.

Agrammes was fortunate enough to escape the onslaught of Alexander. But it is doubtful whether he had the ability or perhaps the inclination to play the part of an Arminius or a Charles Martel, had the occasion arisen. But there was at this time another Indian who was made of different stuff. This was Chandragupta, the Sandrokoptos (Sandrokottos, etc.) of the classical writers. The **rise of Chandragupta** is thus described by Justin:[1]

"India after the death of Alexander had shaken, as it were, the yoke of servitude from its neck and put his governors to death. The author of this liberation was

[1] Watson's tr., p. 142 with slight emendations.

Sandrocottus This man was of humble origin, but was stimulated to aspire to regal power by supernatural encouragement; for, having offended Alexander[1] by his boldness of speech and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by swiftness of foot; and while he was lying asleep, after his fatigue, a lion of great size having come up to him, licked off with his tongue the sweat that was running from him and after gently waking him, left him. Being first prompted by this prodigy to conceive hopes of royal dignity he drew together a band of robbers,[2] and solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty.[3] Sometime after, as he was going to war with the generals of Alexander, a wild elephant of great bulk presented itself before him of its own accord and, as if tamed down to gentleness, took him on its back and became his guide in the war and conspicuous in fields of battle. Sandrocottus thus acquired a throne when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness."

The above account, shorn of its marvellous element, amounts to this, that Chandragupta, a man of non-

[1] Some modern scholars propose to read 'Nandium' (Nanda) in place of 'Alexandrum'. Such conjectural emendations by modern editors often mislead students who have no access to original sources and make the confusion regarding the early career of Chandragupta worse confounded (*cf. Indian Culture*, Vol. II. No. 3, p. 558, for 'boldness of speech', *cf.* Grote XII. 141, case of Kleitus, and pp. 147 ff, case of Kallisthenes). After his (Sandrocottus') victory he forfeited, by his tyranny, all title to the name of a liberator, for he oppressed with servitude the very people whom he had emancipated from foreign thraldom—Justin. The tyranny of the *dushṭāmātyas* is known to Indian literature. But the sovereign himself is noted for his justice in early Maurya times.

[2] The original expression used by Justin has the sense of 'mercenary soldier' as well as that of 'robber'. And the former sense is in consonance with Indian tradition recorded by Hemachandra in the *Pariśishṭaparvan* (VIII. 253-54):

Dhātuvādopārjitena draviṇena Chaṇiprasūḥ
chakrepattyādi sāmagrīṁ Nandamuchchhettumudyataḥ

i.e., Chāṇakya gathered for Chandragupta an army with wealth found underground, (lit. 'with the aid of mineralogy') for the purpose of uprooting Nanda.

[3] According to the interpretation accepted by Hultzsch—''instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government'.

monarchical rank, placed himself at the head of the Indians who chafed under the Macedonian yoke, and after Alexander's departure defeated his generals and "shook the yoke of servitude from the neck" of India. The verdict of the Hydaspas was thus reversed.[1]

The **ancestry of Chandragupta** is not known for certain. Hindu literary tradition connects him with the Nanda dynasty of Magadha.[2] Tradition recorded in Mediaeval inscriptions, however, represents the Maurya family (from which he sprang) as belonging to the solar race.[3] From Māndhātṛi, a prince of that race, sprang the Maurya line." In the *Rājputāna Gazetteer*,[4] the Moris (Mauryas) are described as a Rājput clan. Jaina tradition recorded in the *Pariśishṭaparvan*[5] represents Chandragupta as the son of a daughter of the chief of a village of peacock-tamers (*Mayūraposhaka*).[6] The *Mahāvaṁsa*[7] calls

[1] The anti-Macedonian movement led by Chandragupta, and those who co-operated with him, probably began in Sind. The Macedonian Satrap of that province withdrew before 321 B.C. Āmbhi and the Paurava remained in possession of portions of the Western and Central Pañjāb and some adjoining regions till sometime after the Triparadeisos agreement of 321 B.C.

[2] The *Mudrārākshasa* calls him not only *Mauryaputra* (Act II, verse 6) but also *Nandānvaya* (Act IV). Kshemendra and Somadeva refer to him as *Pūrvananda-suta*, son of the genuine Nanda, as opposed to Yoga-Nanda. The commentator on the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* (IV 24—Wilson IX. 187) says that Chandragupta was the son of Nanda by a wife named Murā, whence he and his descendants were called Mauryas. Dhuṇḍhirāja, the commentator on the *Mudrārākshasa*, informs us on the other hand that Chandragupta was the eldest son of Maurya who was the son of the Nanda king Sarvārthasiddhi by Murā, daughter of a *Vṛishala* (Śūdra?).

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, II. 222. The *Mahāvaṁsaṭīkā* also connects the Mauryas with the Śākyas who, as is well known, claimed to belong to the race of Āditya (the Sun). *Cf. also Avadānakalpalatā*, No. 59.

[4] II A. the *Mewar Residency*, compiled by Major K. D. Erskine (p. 14).

[5] Page 56; VIII. 229f.

[6] Buddhist tradition also testifies to the supposed connection between the expressions Moriya (Maurya) and Mora or Mayūra (peacock)—see Turnour, *Mahāvaṁsa* (Mahāwansa), xxxix f. Aelian informs us that tame peacocks were kept in the parks of the Maurya Palace at Pāṭaliputra. Sir John Marshall points out that figures of peacocks were employed to decorate some of the projecting ends of the architraves of the east gateway at Sāñchi (*A Guide to Sāñchī*, pp. 44, 62). Foucher (*Monuments of Sanchi*, 231) does not regard these birds as a sort of canting badge for the dynasty of the Mauryas. He apparently prefers to imagine in them a possible allusion to the *Mora Jātaka*.

[7] Geiger's Translation, p. 27. *Moriyānaṁ Khattiyānaṁ vaṁse jāta.*

him a scion of the *Khattiya* clan styled Moriya (Maurya). In the *Divyāvadāna*[1] Bindusāra, the son of Chandragupta, claims to be an anointed Kshatriya, *Kshatriya Mūrdhābhishikta*. In the same work[2] Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, calls himself a Kshatriya. In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta*[3] the Moriyas are represented as the ruling clan of Pipphalivana, and as belonging to the Kshatriya caste. As the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* is the most ancient of the works referred to above, and forms part of the early Buddhist canon, its evidence should be preferred to that of later compositions. It is, therefore, practically certain that Chandragupta belonged to a Kshatriya community, *viz.*, the Moriya (Maurya) clan.

In the sixth century B.C. the **Moriyas** were the ruling clan of the little republic of Pipphalivana which probably lay between Rummindei in the Nepalese Tarai and Kasia in the Gorakhpur district. They must have been absorbed into the Magadhan empire along with the other states of Eastern India. Tradition avers that they were reduced to great straits in the fourth century B.C., and young Chandragupta grew up among peacock-tamers, herdsmen and hunters in the Vindhyan forest. The classical notices of his encounter with a lion and an elephant accord well with his residence amidst the wild denizens of that sequestered region. During the inglorious reign of Agrammes, when there was general disaffection amongst his subjects, the Moriyas evidently came into prominence, probably under the **leadership of Chandra gupta.** These clansmen were no longer rulers and were merely Magadhan subjects. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that Justin calls Chandragupta a man of humble origin. Plutarch, as well as Justin, informs us that Chandragupta paid a visit to Alexander. Plutarch says[4] "Androkottus himself, who was then a lad, saw Alexander

[1] Cowell and Neil's Ed., p. 370.
[2] Page 409.
[3] *SBE.*, XI. pp. 134-135.
[4] *Life of Alexander*, lxii.

himself and afterwards used to declare that Alexander might easily have conquered the whole country, as the then king was hated by his subjects on account of his mean and wicked disposition." From this passage it is not unreasonable to infer that Chandragupta visited Alexander with the intention of inducing the conqueror to put an end to the rule of the tyrant of Magadha. His conduct may be compared to that of Rānā Saṁgrāma Siṁha who invited Bābur to put an end to the *regime* of Ibrāhim Lūdi.[1] Apparently Chandragupta found Alexander as stern a ruler as Agrammes, for we learn from Justin that the Macedonian king did not scruple to give orders to kill the intrepid Indian lad for his boldness of speech.[2] The young Maurya apparently thought of ridding his country of both the oppressors, Macedonian as well as Indian. With the help of Kauṭilya, also called Chānakya or Vishṇugupta, son of a Brāhmaṇa of Taxila, he is said to have overthrown the infamous Nanda. Traditional accounts of the conflict between Chandragupta and the last Nanda are preserved in the *Milindapañho*, the Purāṇas, the *Mudrārākshasa*, the *Mahāvaṁsa Ṭīkā* and the *Jaina Pariśishṭaparvan*. The *Milindapañho*[3] tells us that the Nanda army was commanded by Bhaddasāla. The Nanda troops were evidently defeated with great slaughter, an exaggerated account of which is preserved in the *Milindapañho*.

"Sometime after" his acquisition of sovereignty, Chandragupta went to war with the prefects or generals of Alexander[4] and crushed their power.

The overthrow of the Nandas, and the **liberation of the Pañjāb** were not the only achievements of the great

[1] Regarding the conduct of Saṁgrāma Siṁha, see Tod's *Rājasthān*, Vol. I, p. 240, n (2) Anne Susannah Beveridge, the *Bābur-nāma in English*, Vol II. p. 529.

[2] As already stated the substitution of 'Nanda' for Alexander cannot be justified.

[3] *SBE.*, Vol. XXXVI p 147.

[4] *Cf.* Smith, *Aśoka*, third edition, p 14n For the relative date of the assumption of sovereignty and the war with the prefects see *Indian Culture*, II No 3, pp 559ff, *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, p. 137.

Maurya. Plutarch tells us[1] that he overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men. Justin also informs us that he was "in possession of India". In his *Beginnings of South Indian History*,[2] Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar says that Māmulanār, an ancient Tamil author, makes frequent allusions to the Mauryas in the past having penetrated with a great army as far as the Podiyil Hill in the Tinnevelly district. The statements of this author are said to be supported by Paraṇar or Param Koṟṟanār and Kallil Āttiraiyanār. The advanced party of the invasion was composed of a warlike people called Kośar.[3] The invaders advanced from the Koṅkaṇ, passing the hills Elilmalai, about sixteen miles north of Cannanore, and entered the Kongu (Coimbatore) district, ultimately going as far as the Podiyil Hill (Malaya?) Unfortunately the name of the Maurya leader is not given. But the expression *Vamba Moriyar*, or Maurya upstarts,[4] would seem to suggest that the first Maurya, *i.e.* Chandragupta, and his adherents were meant.[5]

Certain Mysore inscriptions refer to Chandragupta's rule in North Mysore. Thus one epigraph says that

[1] Alex LXII

[2] Chap. II. *cf. JRAS.*, 1924, 666.

[3] For the Kośar see *Indian Culture*, I, pp. 97 ff *Cf.* Kośakāra, ANM, 251 ff

[4] *Beginnings of South Indian History*, p 89. Cf. *Maurye nave rājani* (*Mudrārākshasa*, Act IV).

[5] Barnett suggests (*Camb. Hist. Ind*, I 596) that the 'Vamba Moriyar' or 'Bastard Mauryas' were possibly a branch of the Konkani Mauryas. But there is hardly any genuine historical record of the penetration of the Mauryas of the Koṅkan deep into the southern part of the Tamil country For other suggestions, see JRAS., 1923, pp. 93-96. Some Tamil scholars hold that "the Moriyar were not allowed to enter Tamilakam, and the last point they reached was the Venkaṭa hill" (IHQ, 1928, p 145). They also reject Dr. Aiyangar's statement about the Kośar. But the view that the arms of Chandragupta possibly reached the Pāṇḍya country in the Far South of India which abounded in pearls and gems receives some confirmation from the *Mudrārākshasa*, Act, III, verse 19, which suggests that the supremacy of the first Maurya eventually extended "from the lord of mountains (the Himālayas), cooled by showers of the spray of the divine stream (Ganges) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the southern ocean, (*Dakshiṇārṇava*) marked by the brilliance of gems flashing with various colours." The description, however, may be purely conventional. Prof. N. Sastri is critical of the account in the Tamil texts (ANM., p. 253f.).

Nāgarkhaṇḍa in the Shikārpur Tāluq was protected by the wise Chandragupta, "an abode of the usages of eminent Kshatriyas".[1] This is of the fourteenth century and little reliance can be placed upon it. But when the statements of Plutarch, Justin, Māmulanār, and the Mysore inscriptions referred to by Rice, are read together, they seem to suggest that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India.

Whatever we may think of Chandragupta's connection with Southern India, there can be no doubt that he pushed his **conquests as far as Surāshtra** in Western India. The Junāgaḍh Rock inscription of the *Mahāksha-trapa* Rudradāman refers to his *Rāshṭriya* or High Commissioner, Pushyagupta, the Vaiśya, who constructed the famous Sudarśana Lake.[2]

Reference has already been made to an Aramaic Inscription from Taxila which mentions the form *Priya-darśana*, a well-known epithet of Aśoka Maurya. But it is well to remember that in the *Mudrārākshasa Priadarśana* is used as a designation of *Chandasiri* or Chandragupta himself.[3] Further, in Rock Edict VIII of Aśoka, his ancestors, equally with himself are styled *Devānaṁpiya*. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that, like his famous grandson, Chandragupta, too, was known as 'Devānaṁpiya Piyadasi' (or 'Priya-darśana'), and it is not always safe to ascribe all epigraphs that make mention of Priyadarśana, irrespective of their contents, to Aśoka the Great.

[1] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 10. Fleet, however, is sceptical about the Jaina tradition (*Ind Ant*, 1892, 156 ff.) *Cf.* also *JRAS*, 1911, 814-17.

[2] The subjugation of the whole of Northern India (*Udīchī*) from the Himālayas to the sea is probably suggested by the following passage of the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* (IX. 1) traditionally ascribed to a minister of Chandragupta *"Deśaḥ Prithivī; tasyāṁ Himavat Samudrāntaram Udichinam yojanasahasra parimānam atiryak Chakravarti-Kshetram"*. Cf. *Mudrārākshasa*, Act III. Verse 19.

[3] Act VI

The Seleukidan War

We learn from Justin[1] that when Chandragupta acquired his throne in India Seleukos (Seleucus), a general of Alexander, was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos was the son of Antiochos, a distinguished general of Philip of Macedon, and his wife Laodike. After the division of the Macedonian Empire among the followers of Alexander he carried on several wars in the east. He first took Babylon,[2] and then his strength being increased by this success, subdued the Bactrians. He next made an expedition into India. Appianus says[3] that he crossed the Indus and waged war on Chandragupta, king of the Indians, who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage[4] with him. Justin also observes that after making a league with Chandragupta, and settling his affairs in the east, Seleukos proceeded to join in the war against Antigonos (301 B.C.). Plutarch supplies us with the information that Chandragupta presented 500 elephants to Seleukos. More important details are given by Strabo who says:[5]

"The Indians occupy (in part) some of the countries situated *along the Indus,* which formerly belonged to the Persians: Alexander deprived the Ariani of them, and established there settlements (or provinces) of his own. But Seleucus Nicator gave them to Sandrocottus in consequence of a marriage contract, and received in turn 500 elephants." "The Indians occupied *a larger portion of Ariana,* which they had received from the Macedonians."[6]

[1] Watson's tr., p. 143.

[2] Seleukos obtained the satrapy of Babylon first after the agreement of Triparadeisos (321 B.C.) and afterwards in 312 B.C. from which year his era is dated. In 306 B.C., he assumed the title of king (*Camb. Anc. His.*, VII, 161; *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I, 433).

[3] *Syr.* 55; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI, p. 114, Hultzsch, xxxiv.

[4] Appianus uses the clear term *kedos* (connection by marriage), and Strabo (XV) only an *epigamia.* The cession of territory *in consequence of the marriage contract* clearly suggests that the wedding did take place.

[5] H. & F., III, p. 125.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 78. Tarn., *Greeks in Bactria and India*, p. 100.

It will be seen that the classical writers do not give us any detailed record of the actual conflict between Seleukos and Chandragupta. They merely speak of the results. There can be no doubt that the invader could not make much headway, and concluded an alliance which was cemented by a marriage contract. In his *Aśoka*[1] Dr. Smith observes that the current notion that the Syrian king "gave his daughter in marriage" to Chandragupta is not warranted by the evidence, which testifies merely to a 'matrimonial alliance'. But the cession of territory "in consequence of the *epigamia*" may rightly be regarded as a dowry given to a bridegroom. The Indian Emperor obtained some of the provinces situated along the Indus which formerly belonged to the Persians. The ceded country comprised a *large portion of Ariana* itself, a fact ignored by Tarn. In exchange the Maurya monarch gave the "comparatively small recompense of 500 elephants". It is believed that the territory ceded by the Syrian king included the four satrapies: Aria, Arachosia, Gedrosia and the Paropanisadai, *i.e.*, Herat, Kandahār, Makrān and Kābul. Doubts have been entertained about this by several scholars including Tarn. The inclusion of the Kābul valley within the Maurya Empire is, however, proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka,[2] the grandson of Chandragupta, which speak of the Yonas and Gandhāras as vassals of the Empire. And the evidence of Strabo probably points to the cession by Seleukos of a large part of the Iranian Tableland besides the riparian provinces on the Indus.

Megasthenes

We learn from the classical writers that after the war the Syrian and Indian Emperors lived on friendly

[1] Third Ed., p. 15.

[2] Dr. G. C. Raychaudhuri draws my attention to an Aramaic inscription of Devānampiya found at Laghman (ancient Lampāka, *BSOAS*, Vol. XIII, Pt. I, 1949, 80ff). This confirms the Greek evidence about the inclusion of Kābul and its neighbourhood within the dominions of the early Mauryas.

terms. Athenaios tells us that Chandragupta sent presents including certain powerful aphrodisiacs to the Syrian monarch.[1] Seleukos sent an envoy to the Maurya court, whose name was Megasthenes. Arrian tells us[2] that Megasthenes originally lived with Sibyrtios, the satrap of Arachosia. He was sent from thence to Pāṭaliputra where he often visited the Maurya Emperor, and wrote a history on Indian affairs. The work of Megasthenes has been lost. The fragments that survive in quotations by later authors like Strabo, Arrian, Diodoros and others, have been collected by Schwanbeck, and translated into English by McCrindle. As Professor Rhys Davids observes, Megasthenes possessed very little critical judgment, and was, therefore, often misled by wrong information received from others. But he is a truthful witness concerning matters which came under his personal observation. The most important piece of information supplied by him is, as Rhys Davids pointed out, the **description of Pāṭaliputra** which Arrian quotes in Chapter X of his *Indica:*

"The largest city in India, named Palimbothra, is in the land of the Prasians, where is the confluence of the river Erannobaos[3] and the Ganges, which is the greatest of rivers. The Erannobaos would be third of the Indian rivers . . . . . . Megasthenes says that on the side where it is longest this city extends 80 *stades* (9½ miles) in length, and that its breadth is fifteen (1¾ miles); that the city has been surrounded with a ditch in breadth 6 *plethra* (606

[1] *Inv. Alex.*, p. 405. Cf. Smith, *EHI*, 4th ed., p. 153. The treaty between Chandragupta and Seleukos ushered in a policy of philhellenism which bore fruit in the succeeding reigns. In the days of Bindusāra and Aśoka there was not only an exchange of embassies with the Hellenistic powers of the West, but the services of Greek philosophers and administrators were eagerly sought by the imperial government.

[2] Chinnock's tr., p. 254.

[3] Erannobaos=Hiraṇyavāha, *i.e.*, the Śoṇa (*Harshacharita*, Pārab's ed., 1918, p. 19). Cf. "*Anuśoṇaṁ Pāṭaliputram*" (Patañjali, II. 1. 2). For references to "Pāṭaliputra in a Tamil classic" see *Aiyangar Com. Vol.*, 355 ff.

feet), and in depth 30 cubits; and that its wall has 570 towers and 64 gates."[1]

There were many other cities in the empire besides Pāṭaliputra. Arrian says, "It would not be possible to record with accuracy the number of the cities on account of their multiplicity. Those which are situated near the rivers or the sea are built of wood: for if they were built of brick they could not long endure on account of the rain and because the rivers overflowing their banks fill the plains with water. But those which have been founded in commanding places, lofty and raised above the adjacent country, are built of brick and mortar." The most important cities of Chandragupta's empire besides the metropolis, were Taxila, Ujjain, Kauśāmbī and possibly Puṇḍranagara.[2]

Ælian gives the following account of the **palace of Chandragupta:** "In the Indian royal palace[3] where the greatest of all the kings of the country resides, besides much else which is calculated to excite admiration, and with which neither Susa, nor Ekbatana can vie (for, methinks, only the well-known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison[4]), there are other wonders besides. In the parks tame peacocks are kept, and pheasants which have been domesticated; there

[1] Cf. *Patañjali*, IV. 3.2; "*Pāṭaliputrakāḥ prāsādāḥ Pāṭaliputrakāḥ prākārā iti.*"

[2] Puṇḍranagara has been identified with Mahāsthānagarh in the Bogra District of Bengal. The identification seems to be confirmed by an inscription, written in early Mauryan Brāhmī character, which has been discovered at Mahāsthāna. The record makes mention of *Puṁḍanagala* and its storehouse filled with coins styled *Gandakas*, *Kākanikas*, etc. and refers to a people called Saḍvargikas (Barua, *IHQ*, 1934, March, 57 ff; D. R. Bhandarkar, *Ep. Ind.*, April, 1931, 83 ff; P. C. Sen, *IHQ*, 1933, 722 ff). Dr. Bhandarkar reads *Sa(ṁ)va(ṁ)gīya* in the place of *Saḍvargika* which is more plausibly suggested by Dr. Barua. If the record really belongs to the early Maurya period the reference to coins is interesting. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal thinks that coins of the Maurya age bear certain symbols that can be recognized (cf. *JRAS*, 1936, 437 ff.).

[3] The "*Sugāṅga*" palace was the favourite resort of Chandragupta (*JRAS*, 1923, 587).

[4] The statement should be remembered by those modern writers who find traces of Persian influence in Maurya architecture.

are shady groves and pasture ground planted with trees, and branches of trees which the art of the woodsman has deftly interwoven; while some trees are native to the soil, others are brought from other parts, and with their beauty enhance the charms of the landscape. Parrots are natives of the country, and keep hovering about the king and wheeling round him and vast though their numbers be, no Indian ever eats a parrot. The Brachmans honour them highly above all other birds—because the parrot alone can imitate human speech. Within the palace grounds are artificial ponds in which they keep fish of enormous size but quite tame. No one has permission to fish from these except the king's sons while yet in their boyhood. These youngsters amuse themselves while fishing in the unruffled sheet of water and learning how to sail their boats."[1]

The imperial palace probably stood close to the modern village of Kumrahār.[2] The unearthing of the ruins of the Maurya pillar-hall and palace near Kumrahār, said to have been built on the model of the throne-room and palace of Darius at Persepolis, led Dr. Spooner to propound the theory that the Mauryas were Zoroastrians.[3] Dr. Smith observed that the resemblance of the Maurya buildings with the Persian palace at Persepolis was not definitely established. Besides, as Professor Chanda observes, "Ethnologists do not recognize high class architecture as test of race, and in the opinion of experts the buildings of Darius and Xerxes at Persepolis are not Persian in style, but are mainly dependent on Babylonian models and bear traces of the influence of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor."

We learn from Strabo[4] that the king usually remained within the palace under the protection of **female guards**[5]

[1] McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, pp. 141-42.
[2] Smith, *The Oxford History of India*, p. 77. Macphail, *Aśoka*, pp. 23-25.
[3] *JRAS*, 1915, pp. 63 ff, 405 ff.
[4] H. & F.'s Tr., Vol. III, p. 106; *cf*. Smith, *EHI*, 3rd ed., p. 123.
[5] The same writer tells us that these women were *bought* from their parents. In view of this statement it is rather surprising that Megasthenes

(cf. *strīgaṇair dhanvibhiḥ* of the *Arthaśāstra*) and appeared in public only on four occasions, *viz.*, in time of war; to sit in his court as a judge; to offer sacrifice and to go on hunting expeditions.

Chandragupta's Government

Chandragupta was not only a great soldier and conqueror, he was a great administrator. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador at his court, has left detailed accounts of his system of government. The edict of his grandson Aśoka, and the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to his minister, **Kautilya,** confirm in many respects the particulars of the organisation of the empire given by the distinguished envoy. The *Arthaśāstra* certainly existed before Bāṇa (seventh century A.D.) and the *Nandisūtra* of the Jainas (not later than the fifth century A.D.). But it is doubtful if, in its present shape, it is as old as the time of the first Maurya[1]. Reference to *Chinapaṭṭa,* China silk, which, be it remembered, occurs frequently in classical Sanskrit literature, points to a later date, as China was clearly outside the horizon of the early Mauryas, and is unknown to Indian epigraphy before the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions. Equally noteworthy is the use of Sanskrit as the official language, a feature not characteristic of the Maurya epoch. A date as late as the Gupta period is, however, precluded by the absence of any reference to the Denarius in the sections dealing with weights and coins. Quite in keeping with this view is the reference to the *Arthaśāstra* contained in Jaina canonical works that were reduced to writing in the Gupta age. We have already adduced grounds for believing that *Arthaśāstra* probably existed before the second century A.D.[2] *Though*

is quoted as saying that none of the Indians employed slaves. Note also the story narrated by Athenaios that Amitrochates, (*i.e.*, Bindusāra) begged Antiochos Soter to buy and send him a professor (Monahan, *The Early History of Bengal*, pp. 164, 176, 179).

[1] For the date of the *Arthaśāstra*, see also Raychaudhuri, *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vol. II, ed. by R. C. Majumdar, pp. 285-87.

[2] P. 8 f. *ante*.

a comparatively late work, it may be used, like the Junāgaḍh Inscription of Rudradāman, to confirm and supplement the information gleaned from earlier sources.

The **Supreme Government** consisted of two main parts:

1. The *Rājā* and
2. The **"Councillors"** and **"Assessors"** (*Mahāmātras*, and *Amātyas* or *Sachivas*).

The *Rājā* or sovereign was the head of the state. He was considered to be a mere mortal, though a favoured mortal, the beloved of the deities.[1] The possession of the material resources of a great empire and control over a vast standing army gave him real power. But there was a body of **ancient rules**, *Porāṇā pakitī*, which even the most masterful despot viewed with respect. The people were an important element of the state. They were looked upon as children for whose welfare the head of the state was responsible, and to whom he owed a debt which could only be discharged by good government. There was a certain amount of decentralisation, notably in the sphere of **local government**, and there was usually at the imperial headquarters, and also at the chief centres of provincial government, a body of ministers who had a right to be consulted specially in times of emergency. Nevertheless the powers of the king were extensive. He had military, judicial, legislative, as well as executive functions. We have already seen that one of the occasions when he left his palace was **war**.[2] He considered plans of military operations with his *Senāpati*[3] or Commander-in-Chief.

He also sat in his **court to administer justice.** "He remains there all day thus occupied, not suffering himself to be interrupted even though the time arrives for attend-

[1] *Cf.* ante 198 n. 10.

[2] Cf. *Strabo*, XV. i; and Kauṭilya, Bk. X.

[3] Kauṭ., p. 38. In the last days of the Maurya empire we find the *Senāpati* overshadowing the king and transferring to himself the allegiance of the troops.

ing to his person. This attention to his person consists of friction with pieces of wood, and he continues to listen to the cause, while the friction is performed by four attendants who surround him."[1] The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* says,[2] "when in the court, he (the king) shall never cause his petitioners to wait at the door, for when a king makes himself inaccessible to his people and entrusts his work to his immediate officers, he may be sure to engender confusion in business, and to cause thereby public disaffection, and himself a prey to his enemies. He shall, therefore, personally attend to the business of gods, of heretics, of Brāhmaṇas learned in the Vedas, of cattle, of sacred places, of minors, the aged, the afflicted, the helpless and of women;—all this in order (of enumeration) or according to the urgency or pressure of those works. All urgent calls he shall hear at once."

As to the king's legislative function we should note that the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[3] calls him "*dharma-pravartaka*", and includes **Rājaśāsana** among the sources of law. As instances of royal "Śāsanas" or rescripts may be mentioned the Edicts of Aśoka, the famous grandson of Chandragupta.

Among **executive functions** of the king, our authorities mention the posting of watchmen, attending to the accounts of receipts and expenditure, appointment of ministers, priests and superintendents, correspondence with the *Mantriparishad* or Council of Ministers, collection of the secret information gathered by spies, reception of envoys, etc.[4]

It was the king who laid down the broad lines of policy and issued rescripts for the guidance of his officers and the people. Control was maintained over the most

[1] H. & F., *Strabo* III, pp. 106-107.

[2] Shamasastry's translation, p. 43.

[3] Bk. III, Chap. I.

[4] Kauṭilya, Bk. I, Chs. xvi; xvii; Bk. VIII, Ch. 1. *Cf.* Aśoka's Rock Edicts III (regulation about *alpa vyayatā* and *alpa bhāṇḍatā*), V (appointment of high officials), VI (relations with the *Parishad*, and collection of information from the *Paṭivedakā*), and XIII (diplomatic relations with foreign powers).

distant officials by an army of secret reporters and overseers and, in the days of Chandragupta's grandson, by itinerant judges. Communication with them was kept up by a network of roads, and garrisons were posted at strategic points.

Kauṭilya holds that *Rājatva* (sovereignty) is possible only with assistance.[1] A single wheel can never move. Hence the king shall employ *Sachivas* and hear their opinion. The **Sachivas** or **Amātyas** of Kauṭilya correspond to the "seventh caste" of Megasthenes which assisted the king in deliberating on public affairs. This class was small in number, but in wisdom and justice excelled all the others.[2]

The most important amongst the *Sachivas* or *Amātyas* were undoubtedly the **Mantrins** or High Ministers, probably corresponding to the **Mahāmātras** of Aśoka's Rock Edict VI and the "advisers of the king" referred to by Diodoros.[3] They were selected from those *Amātyas* whose character had been tested under all kinds of allurements.[4] They were given the highest salary, *viz.*, 48,000 *paṇas* per annum.[5] They assisted the king in examining the character of the *Amātyas* who were employed in ordinary department.[6] All kinds of administrative measures were preceded by consultation with three or four of them.[7] In works of emergency (*ātyayike kārye*) they were summoned along with the *Mantriparishad*.[8] They exercised a certain amount of control over the Imperial Princes.[9] They accompanied the king to the battle-field, and gave encouragement to the troops.[10]

[1] *Cf.* Manu, VII. 55.

[2] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 413.

[3] II. 41.

[4] *Sarvopadhā-śuddhān Mantriṇaḥ kuryāt.—Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 17. For *upadhā* see also the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Skanda Gupta.

[5] Kauṭilya, p. 247. According to Smith (*EHI*, 4th ed., p. 149) the value of a silver *paṇa* may be taken as not far from a shilling.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 28.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 29, *Cf.* Aśoka's Rock Edict VI.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 333.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 368. *Cf.* the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāba.

Kauṭilya was evidently one of those *Mantrins*. Another minister (or *Pradeshṭṛi*?) was apparently Maniyatappo, a Jaṭilian, who helped the king to "confer the blessings of peace on the country by extirpating marauders who were like unto thorns."[1] That there were at times more than one *Mantrin* is proved by the use of the plural *Mantriṇaḥ*.

In addition to the *Mantrins* there was the **Mantri-parishad**, *i.e.*, Assembly of Counsellors or Council of Ministers. The existence of the *Parishad* as an important element of the Maurya constitution is proved by the third and sixth Rock Edicts of Aśoka.[2] The members of the *Mantriparishad* were not identical with the *Mantrins*. In several passages of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* the *Mantrins* are sharply distinguished from the *Mantriparishad*.[3] The latter evidently occupied an inferior position. Their salary was only 12,000 *paṇas*, whereas the salary of a *Mantrin* was 48,000. They do not appear to have been consulted on ordinary occasions, but were summoned along with the *Mantrins* when *Ātyayika kārya*,[4] i.e., works of emergency had to be transacted. The king was to be guided by the decision of the majority (*Bhūyishṭhāḥ*). They also attended the king at the time of the reception of envoys.[5] From the passage "*Mantriparishadaṁ dvādaśā-mātyān kurvīta*"—"the Council of Ministers should consist of twelve *Amātyas*," it appears that the *Parishad* used to be recruited from all kinds of Amātyas (not necessarily from *Mantrins* alone). From Kauṭilya's denunciation of a king with a "*Kshudraparishad*,"[6] a small council, his rejection of the views of the Mānavas, Bārhaspatyas and the Auśanasas, his preference for an

[1] Turnour's *Mahāvaṁsa*, p. xlii. The evidence is late.

[2] Note also Pliny's reference to noble and rich Indians who sit in council with the king (Monahan, *The Early History of Bengal*, 148); cf. *Mbh*. iii, 127. 8. *Amātyaparishad*; xii, 320, 139 **Amātya Samiti.**

[3] *Cf.* pp. 20, 29, 247.

[4] *Arthaśāstra*, 29. Cf. *Mbh*, iv. 30. 8. Aśoka's R. E. VI.

[5] *Arthaśāstra*, p. 45.

[6] P. 259.

"*Akshudra-parishad*", a council that is not small, and his reference to Indra's *Parishad* of a thousand *Ṛishis*, it may be presumed that he wanted to provide for the needs of a growing empire. Such an empire was undoubtedly that of Chandragupta who may have been prevailed upon by his advisers to constitute a fairly big assembly.[1]

Besides the Mantrins and the Mantriparishad, there was another class of *Amātyas* who filled the great administrative and judicial appointments.[2] The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* says[3] that the "*dharmopadhāśuddha*" *Amātyas*, officers purified by religious test, should be employed in civil[4] and criminal[5] courts, *the "arthopadhāśuddha" Amātyas*, officers purified by money-test, should be employed as *Samāhartṛi* ("Chancellor of the Exchequer and Minister of the Interior") and *Sannidhātṛi* (High Treasurer and Keeper of Stores;[6] the "*kāmopadhāsuddha*" *Amātyas*, officials purified by love-test, should be appointed to superintend the pleasure grounds, the "*bhayopadhāśuddha*" *Amātyas*, officers purified by fear-test, should be appointed to do work requiring immediate attention (*āsanna-kārya*), while those who are proved to be impure should be employed in mines, timber and elephant forests,[7]

[1] The *Divyāvadāna* (p. 372) refers to the five hundred councillors (*Pañchāmātyaśatāni*) of Bindusāra, son and successor of Chandragupta Maurya. Patañjali refers to *Chandragupta Sabhā*. But we have no indication as to its constitution.

[2] Cf. *the Karma-Sachivas* of the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I.

[3] P. 17. *Cf.* McCrindle, *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, 41, 42.

[4] Civil (*Dharmasthīya*) Courts were established "in the cities of *Saṅgrahaṇa* (in the midst of a collection of ten villages), *Droṇamukha* (in the centre of four hundred villages), *Sthānīya* (in the centre of eight hundred villages), and at places where districts met (*Janapada-sandhi*;? union of districts)", and consisted of three *Dharmasthas* (judges versed in the sacred law) and three *Amātyas*.

[5] A Criminal (*Kaṇṭakaśodhana*) Court consisted of 3 *Amātyas*, or 3 *Pradeshṭṛis*. The functions of the latter will be described later on.

[6] For the duties of these officers see Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, Bk. II, 5-6, 35; Bk. IV, 4; Bk. V, 2. For the revenue system under the Mauryas, see Ghoshal, *Hindu Revenue System*, pp. 165 ff.

[7] Cf. *Nāgavana* of Pillar Edict V.

and manufactories. Untried *Amātyas* were to be employed in ordinary or insignificant departments (*sāmānya adhikaraṇa*). Persons endowed with the qualifications required in an *Amātya* (*Amātyasampadopeta*) were appointed *Nisṛishṭārthāḥ* or Ministers Plenipotentiary, *Lekhakas* or Ministers of Correspondence, and *Adhyakshas* or Superintendents.

The statements of the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* regarding the employment of *Amātyas* as the chief executive and judicial officers of the realm, are confirmed by the classical writers. Strabo, for example, observes,[1] "the seventh caste consists of counsellors and assessors (*Symbouloi* and *Synedroi*) of the king. To these persons belong the offices of state, tribunals of justice, and the whole administration of affairs." Arrian also says, "from them are chosen their rulers, governors of provinces, deputies, treasurers, generals, admirals, controllers of expenditure and superintendents of agriculture."

The **adhyakshas** who formed the pivot of the Kauṭilîyan administration, are evidently referred to by Strabo's translators as "Magistrates" in the following passage:[2]

"Of the **Magistrates**, some have the charges of the market,[3] others of the city, others of the soldiery.[4] Some[5] have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, and inspect the closed **reservoirs from which water is distributed by canals**, so that all may have an equal use of it. These persons have charge also of the hunters, and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either. They collect the taxes, and superintend the occupations connected with land, as wood-cutters, carpenters, workers in brass, and miners. They superintend the public roads, and place a **pillar at every ten stadia** to

[1] H. & F., Vol. III, p. 103. *Cf.* Diodoros, II. 41.

[2] One class of *Adhyakshas*, those in charge of women, are referred to in the Aśokan inscriptions as Mahāmātras.

[3] "District" according to the *Cambridge History of India*, I. 417.

[4] Cf. *the Durga-rāshṭra-daṇḍa-mukhyas* of Kauṭilya, Bk. XIII, Chs. III and V.

[5] *I.e.*, the district officials (Agronomoi.)

indicate the byways and distances. **Those who have charge of the city** (*astynomoi*) are divided into six bodies of five each.[1] Next to the Magistrates of the city is a third body of **governors, who have the care of military affairs.** This class also consists of six divisions each composed of five persons.[2]

The Magistrates in charge of the city and those in charge of military affairs are evidently the same as the **Nagarādhyakshas** and **Balādhyakshas** of the *Arthaśāstra*.[3] Dr. Smith remarks,[4] "the Boards described by Megasthenes as in charge of the business of the capital and the army are unknown to the author (Kauṭilya), who contemplated each such charge as the duty of a *single* officer. The creation of the Boards may have been an innovation effected by Chandragupta personally." But the historian overlooks the fact that Kauṭilya distinctly says: *"Bahumukhyaṁ anityaṁ chādhikaraṇaṁ sthāpayet,"* "each department shall be officered by several temporary heads;"[5] *"Adhyakshāḥ Saṅkhyāyaka - Lekhaka - Rūpadarśaka - Nīvī-*

[1] Each body was responsible for one of the following departments, *viz.*, (1) the mechanical arts, (2) foreign residents, (3) registration of births and deaths, (4) trade, commerce, weights and measures, (5) supervision and sale of manufactured articles and (6) collection of tithes on sales. In their collective capacity they looked after public buildings, markets, harbours and temples. Prices were regulated by them.

[2] Each division or Board was responsible for one of the following departments, *viz.*, the navy, transport and commissariat (cf. *Vishṭi-karmāṇi* of Kauṭilya, Bk. X, Ch. iv), the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants. In the *Śāntiparva* of the *Mahābhārata* the divisions are stated to be six (CIII. 38) or eight (LIX. 41-42):

Rathā Nāgā Hayāśchaiva Pādātāśchaiva Pāṇḍava
Vishṭir Nāvaś Charāśchaiva Deśikā iti chāshṭamam
Aṅgānyetāni Kauravya prakāśāni balasya tu

"Chariots, elephants, horses, infantry, burden-carriers, ships, spies with local guides as the eighth—these are the open "limbs" of a fighting force, O descendant of Kuru."

The *Raghuvaṁśa* (IV, 26) refers to *Shaḍvidham balam*. Cf. *Mbh*, V. 96. 16.

[3] Mysore Ed., 1919, p. 55. Nagara-*Dhānya-Vyāvahārika-Kārmāntika*-**Balādhyakshāḥ**. Cf. *Balapradhānā* and *Nigamapradhānāḥ* of *Mbh*, V. 2. 6.

[4] *EHI*, 1914, p. 141. Cf. Monahan, *Early History of Bengal*, pp. 157-64. Stein, *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya*, pp. 233 ff.

[5] *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, p. 60. On page 57 we have the following passage—**Hasty-asva-ratha-padātam-aneka-mukhyam-avasthāpayet**, *i.e.*, elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry shall each be placed under *many* chiefs.

grāhak-Ottarādhyaksha-sakhāḥ karmāṇi kuryuḥ", "the Superintendents shall carry on their duties with the assistance of accountants, scribes, coin-examiners, stock-takers and additional secret overseers." Evidently Dr. Smith notices only the *Adhyakshas* but ignores the existence of the *Uttarādhyakshas* and others. As in regard to the *Arthaśāstra* Smith notices only the *Adhyakshas*, so in regard to the classical accounts he takes note only of the Boards, but ignores the **chiefs** who are expressly mentioned in two passages,[1] *viz.*—

"One division is associated with the *Chief Naval Superintendent*," "another (division) is associated with the *person who has the charge of the bullock-teams*." The Chief Naval Superintendent and the Person-in-Charge of the Bullock-teams, doubtless, correspond to the *Nāvadhyaksha* and the *Go'dhyaksha* of the *Arthaśāstra*. It is a mistake to think that the *Nāvadhyaksha* of the early Hindu period was a purely civil official, for he was responsible for the destruction of *Hiṁsrikās* (pirate ships?) and the *Mahābhārata*[2] clearly refers to the navy as one of the *aṅgas* or limbs of the Royal Forces. The civil duties of the *Nāvadhyaksha* have their counterpart in those of Megasthenes' Admiral relating to the "letting out of ships on hire for the transport both of passengers and merchandize."[3]

Central popular assemblies like those that existed among the Lichchhavis, Mallas, Śākyas and other *Saṅghas* had no place in the Maurya constitution. The custom of summoning a great assembly of *Grāmikas* or Village Headmen seems also to have fallen into disuse. The royal council gradually became an aristocratic body attended only by nobles and rich men.[4]

Administration of Justice

At the head of the judiciary stood the king himself.

[1] H. & F., *Strabo*, III, p. 104.
[2] XII. lix, 41-42.
[3] *Strabo*, XV. 1. 46.
[4] Pliny quoted in Monahan's *Early History of Bengal*, 148.

Besides the royal court there were special tribunals of justice both in cities (*nagara*) and country parts (*janapada*) presided over by *Vyāvahārika Mahāmātras* and *Rājūkas* respectively. Greek writers refer to judges who listened to cases of foreigners. Petty cases in villages were doubtless decided by the headmen and the village elders. All our authorities testify to the severity of the penal code. But the rigours of judicial administration were sought to be mitigated by Aśoka, grandson of Chandragupta, who meted out equal justice to all and instituted the system of itinerant *Mahāmātras* to check maladministration in the outlying provinces. Considerable discretion was, however, allowed to the *Rājūkas*. We are informed by Greek writers that "theft was a thing of very rare occurrence" among Indians. They express their surprise at this for they go on to observe that the people "have no written laws but are ignorant of writing, and conduct all matters by memory." The assertion about the Indians' ignorance of writing is hardly correct. Nearchus and Curtius record that Indians use pieces of closely woven linen and the tender bark of trees for writing on. Strabo tells us that a philosopher who has any useful suggestion to offer, commits it to writing. Attention may also be invited to the marks on Mauryan pillars intended to show the by-roads and distances.[1]

Provincial Government

The Empire was divided into a number of provinces which were subdivided into *āhāras* or *vishayas* (districts), because "no single administration could support the Atlantean load." The exact number of provinces in Chandragupta's time is unknown. In the time of his grandson, Aśoka, there were at least five, *viz.*:

1. Uttarāpatha[2] ... ... capital, Taxila

[1] Monahan, *Early History of Bengal*, pp. 143, 157, 167 f.
[2] *Divyāvadāna*, p. 407.

2. Avantiraṭṭha[1] ... ... Capital Ujjayinī
3. Dakshiṇāpatha ... ... " Suvarṇagiri (?)
4. Kaliṅga ... .. " Tosali
5. Prāchya, Prāchīna (Prasii)[2] . " Pāṭaliputra

Of these only the first two and the last one can be said, with any amount of certainty, to have formed parts of Chandragupta's Empire. But it is not altogether improbable that Dakshiṇāpatha, too, was one of Chandragupta's provinces. The outlying provinces were ruled by princes of the blood royal who were usually styled *Kumāras*. We learn from the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[3] that the salary of a *Kumāra* was 12,000 paṇas *per annum*.

The Home Provinces, *i.e.*, Prāchya and the Madhyadeśa (Eastern India and Mid-India), were directly ruled by the Emperor himself with the assistance of *Mahāmātras* or High Officers stationed in important cities like Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbī, etc.

Besides the Imperial Provinces, Maurya India included a number of territories which enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy. Arrian refers to **peoples who were autonomous and cities which enjoyed a democratic Government.**[4] The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*[5] refers to a number of **Saṅghas**, *i.e.*, economic, military or political corporations or confederations evidently enjoying autonomy in certain matters, *e.g.*, Kamboja, Surāshṭra, etc. The Kambojas find prominent mention as a unit in the Thirteenth Rock Edict of Aśoka. R. E. V. alludes to various *nations* or *peoples on the western border* (**Aparātā**) in addition to those named specifically.[6] It is not improbable that Surāshṭra was included among these nations which, judged by the title of its local rulers, enjoyed a considerable amount of autonomy. The commentary on

[1] *The Questions of King Milinda*, pt. II, p. 250 n. *Mahāvaṁsa*, Ch. XIII; *Mahābodhivaṁsa*, p. 98.
[2] *Cf. the Questions of Milinda*, II. 250 n.
[3] P. 247.
[4] Monahan, *The Early History of Bengal*, 150; Chinnock, *Arrian*, 413.
[5] P. 378.
[6] IHQ, 1931, 631.

the *Petavatthu* refers to one of the local *Rājās* named Piṅgala,[1] the contemporary of Aśoka. Another contemporary,[2] the *Yavana-rāja* Tushāspha finds mention in Rudradāman's inscription at Junāgaḍh. The *Yavana-rāja* was probably a Greek chief of the North-West who was appointed to look after the affairs of Surāshṭra by Aśoka, just as Rājā Mān Singh of Amber was appointed *Subadār* of Bengal by Akbar. His relations with Aśoka may *also* be compared to that subsisting between the *Rājā* of the Śākya state and Pasenadi. In the time of the first Maurya Surāshṭra had an officer named Pushyagupta, the *Vaiśya* who is described as a *Rāshṭriya* of Chandragupta. In the *Bombay Gazetteer*,[3] the word *Rāshṭriya* was taken to mean a brother-in-law. Kielhorn, however, in the *Epigraphia Indica*,[4] took the term to mean a provincial Governor. This rendering does not seem to be quite adequate because we have already seen that Surāshṭra had possibly its group of *Rājās* in the Maurya Age and could not be regarded as an Imperial Province under a bureaucratic governor of the ordinary type. The *Rāshṭriya* of the inscription seems to have been a sort of Imperial High Commissioner,[5] and the position of Pushyagupta in Surāshṭra was probably like that of Lord Cromer in Egypt. Neither the *Arthaśāstra* nor the edicts of Aśoka mention clearly any class of officials called *Rāsh-*

[1] Law, *Buddhist Conception of Spirits*, 47 ff.

[2] Attempts in recent times to assign Tushāspha to the post-Aśokan period lack plausibility. In the Junāgaḍh epigraph the name of the suzerain invariably accompanies that of the local ruler or officer. There is no reason to think that the relationship between Aśoka and Tushāspha was different from that between Chandragupta and Pushyagupta or between Rudradāman and Suviśākha.

[3] Vol. I, Part I, p. 13

[4] Vol. VIII, p. 46.

[5] *Cf.* the type met with in the Near East after the First World War. The High Commissioner acted for the *de facto* paramount power. His office does not preclude the possibility of the existence of a local potentate or potentates. Note also Wendel Wilkie's observation (*One World*, p. 13) on the British "ambassador" to Egypt, who is "for all practical purposes its actual ruler".

triya.[1] It is, however, probable, that the *Rāshṭriya* was identical with the *Rāshṭrapāla* whose salary was equal to that of a *Kumāra* or Prince.[2]

A hereditary bureaucracy does not seem to have come to existence in the early Maurya period at least in the territory of Surāshṭra. The assumption of the title of *Rājā* by local rulers and the grant of autonomy to the *Rājūkas* in the days of *Aśoka* ultimately let loose centrifugal forces which must have helped in the dismemberment of the empire.

Overseers and Spies

The classical writers refer to a class of men called Overseers (*Episkopoi*) who "overlook what is done throughout the country and in the cities, and make report to the king where the Indians are ruled by a king, or the magistrates where the people have a democratic Government."[3] Strabo calls this class of men the *Ephori* or Inspectors. "They are," says he, "intrusted with the superintendence of all that is going on, and it is their duty to report pri-

[1] The Aśokan inscriptions, however, mention the *Raṭhikas* and the *Pāli English Dictionary*, edited by Rhys Davids and Stede compares *Raṭṭhika* with *Rāshṭriya*.

[2] *Arthaśāstra*, p. 247. For *Rāshṭriya* see also *Mbh*, XII. 85. 12; 87. 9. According to Amara (V. 14) a *Rāshtriya* is a *rājasyāla* (brother-in-law of the king). But *Kshīrasvāmin* says in his commentary that except in a play a *Rāshṭriya* is a *Rāshṭrādhikṛita*, i.e. an officer appointed to look after or supervise the affairs of a *rāshṭra*, state or province. *Cf.*, the Macedonian *episkopos*. Note the position of Eudamos in relation to the Indian *Rājās* of the Pañjāb, and that of Pratihāra *Tantrapālas* of the tenth century A.D. Dr. Barua draws attention (in *IC*, X. 1944, pp. 88ff.) to several texts including Buddhaghosha's statement that during a royal state-drive the place assigned to the *Rāshtriyas* was just between the *Mahāmātras* and Brahmins shouting the joy of victory. They themselves were gorgeously dressed holding swords and the like in their hands. This may well be true. But the texts cited by him are not adequate enough to prove that *in the days of Chandragupta Maurya* the *Rāshṭrika* or *Rāshṭriya* was nothing more than the foremost among the bankers, business magnates, etc., who functioned as Mayors, Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace. The analogy of Tushāspha and Suviśākha mentioned in the same epigraph suggests that the *Rāshṭriya* here was a more exalted functionary, and that the evidence of Kshīrasvāmin cannot be lightly brushed aside.

[3] Chinnock, *Arrian*, p. 413.

vately to the king...The best and the most faithful persons are appointed to the office of Inspectors."[1] The Overseer of Arrian and the Inspector of Strabo may correspond to the *Rāshṭriya* of the Junāgaḍh Inscription or to the *Pradeshṭṛi* or the *Gūḍha-Purushas* (secret emissaries) of the *Arthaśāstra*. *Pradeshṭṛi* may be derived from *Pradiś* which means 'to point,' 'to communicate'.[2]

Strabo speaks of different classes of Inspectors. He tells us that the City Inspectors employed as their coadjutors the city courtesans; and the Inspectors of the Camp, the women who followed it. The employment of women of easy virtue as spies is also alluded to by the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*. According to that work there were two groups of spies, *viz.*:

1. *Saṁsthāḥ*, or stationary spies, consisting of secret agents styled *Kāpaṭika, Udāsthita, Gṛihapatika, Vaidehaka* and *Tāpasa*, i.e., fraudulent disciples, recluses, householders, merchants and ascetics.

2. *Sañchārāḥ* or wandering spies,[3] including emissaries termed *Satri, Tīkshṇa* and *Rashada*, i.e., class-mates, firebrands and poisoners and certain women described as *Bhikshukīs* (mendicants), *Parivrājikās* (wandering nuns), *Muṇḍas* (shavelings) and *Vṛishalīs*. It is to the last class, *viz.*, the *Vṛishalīs* that Strabo evidently refers.[4] We have also explicit references to courtesan (*puṁśchalī, veśyā, rūpājīvā*) spies in the *Arthaśāstra*.[5]

Care of Foreigners

It is clear from the accounts of Diodoros[6] and Strabo[7] that the Maurya government took special care of foreigners.

[1] H. and F., *Strabo*, III, p. 103.
[2] *Cf.* Thomas, *JRAS*, 1915, p. 97.
[3] *Cf.* Lüders, Ins. No. 1200.
[4] A *Vṛishalī* is taken to mean a *gaṇikā* or courtesan by the author of the *Bhagavadajjukīyam* (p. 94).
[5] Pp. 224, 316 of the *Arthaśāstra* (1919).
[6] II. 42.
[7] XV. I. 50.

"Among the Indians officers are appointed even for foreigners, whose duty is to see that no foreigner is wronged. Should any one of them lose his health, they send physicians to attend him, and take care of him otherwise, and if he dies they bury him, and deliver over such property as he leaves to his relatives. The judges also decide cases in which foreigners are concerned with the greatest care and come down sharply on those who take unfair advantage of them."[1]

Village Administration

The administrative and judicial business of villages was, in Ancient India, carried on by the *Grāmikas*,[2] *Grāmabhojakas* or *Āyuktas* who were, no doubt, assisted by the village elders.[3] The omission of the *Grāmika* from the list of salaried officials given in the *Arthaśāstra*[4] is significant. It probably indicates that in the days of the author of the treatise the *Grāmika* was not a salaried servant of the crown, but possibly an elected[5] official of the villagers. The king's servant in the village was the *Grāma-bhṛitaka*[6] or *Grāma-bhojaka*.[7] Above the *Grāmika* the *Arthaśāstra* places the *Gopa*,[8] who looked after 5 or 10 villages, and the *Sthānika* who controlled one quarter of a *janapada* or district. The work of these officers was super-

[1] McCrindle, *Megasthenes and Arrian*, 1926, p. 42.

[2] Fick, *Social Organization*, 162; *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 157, 172. *Cf* Luders, *Ins.* Nos. 48, 69*a*. The Kaliṅga Edicts refer to *Āyuktas* who helped the princely viceroys and *Mahāmātras* in carrying out Imperial Policy In the early Post-Mauryan and Scythian Age they are distinctly referred to as village officials (Lüders' List, No. 1347). In the Gupta Age the designation is applied to various functionaries including district officers.

[3] *Grāma-vṛiddhas*, *Artha*, pp. 48, 161, 169, 178. *Cf*. Lüders, *Ins.*, No. 1327. *Rock Edicts*, V and VIII refer to *Mahālakas* and *Vṛiddhas*

[4] Bk V, Ch. III.

[5] There is, however, evidence to show that in early times *adhikritas* were appointed for villages by the paramount ruler (*Praśna Upanishad*, III 4).

[6] *Artha.*, pp. 175, 248.

[7] The *Grāmabhojaka* of the *Jātakas* was an *amātya* of the king (Fick, *Social Organization in N.-E. Ind.*, p. 160).

[8] The Gopas proper do not find mention in early epigraphs, but Lüders' *Ins.*, No. 1266, mentions "*Senā-gopas*".

vised, according to that treatise by the *Samāhartṛi* with the help of the *Pradeshṭris*.[1] Rural administration must have been highly efficient. We are told by Greek observers that the tillers of the soil received adequate protection from all injury and would devote the whole of their time to cultivation.

Revenue and Expenditure

The cost of civil and military administration even at the centre must have been enormous. The chief sources of revenue from villages were the *Bhāga* and the *Bali*. The *Bhāga* was the king's share of the produce of the soil which was normally fixed at one-sixth, though in special cases it was raised to one-fourth or reduced to one-eighth. *Bali* seems to have been an extra impost from the payment of which certain tracts were exempted. According to Greek writers husbandmen paid, in addition to a fourth part of the produce of the soil, a land tribute because, according to their belief, "all India is the property of the crown and no private person is permitted to own land." Taxes on land were collected by the *Agronomoi* who measured the land and superintended the irrigation works. Other state dues included tribute and prescribed services from those who worked at trades, and cattle from herdsmen. In urban areas the main sources of revenue included birth and death taxes, fines and tithes on sales. The *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali has an interesting reference to the Mauryas' love of gold which led them to deal in images of deities. The distinction between taxes levied in rural and in fortified areas respectively is known to the *Arthaśāstra* which refers to certain high revenue functionaries styled the *Samāhartṛi* and the *Sannidhātṛi*. No such

[1] *Artha.*, pp. 142, 217. We do not know how far the system described in the treatise on polity applies to the early Maurya period. In the days of Aśoka the work of supervision was done largely by special classes of *Mahāmātras* (*cf.* R.E.V. and the Kaliṅga Edicts), *Pulisā* (agents) and *Rājukas* (Pillar Edict IV).

officials are, however, mentioned in Maurya inscriptions. Greek writers, on the other hand, refer to 'treasurers of the state' or 'superintendents of the treasury'.

A considerable part of the revenue was spent on the army. The artisans, too, received maintenance from the Imperial exchequer. Herdsmen and hunters received an allowance of grain in return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls. Another class which benefited from royal bounty were the philosophers among whom were included Brāhmaṇas as well as *Śramaṇas* or ascetics. Vast sums were also spent for irrigation, construction of roads, erection of buildings and fortifications, and establishment of hospitals in the days of Chandragupta's grandson.

The last Days of Chandragupta

Jaina tradition recorded in the *Rājāvalīkathe*[1] avers that Chandragupta was a Jaina and that, when a great famine occurred, he abdicated in favour of his son Simhasena and repaired to Mysore where he died. Two inscriptions on the north bank of the Kāverī near Seringapatam of about 900 A.D., describe the summit of the Kalbappu Hill, *i.e.*, Chandragiri, as marked by the footprints of Bhadrabāhu and Chandragupta *Munipati*.[2] Dr. Smith observes:[3] "The Jain tradition holds the field, and no alternative account exists." Chandragupta died about 300 B.C., after a reign of 24 years.[4]

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1892, 157.

[2] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, pp. 3-4.

[3] *The Oxford History of India*, p. 76. As already stated, Fleet is sceptical about the Jaina tradition (*Ind. Ant.*, 1892, 156f). According to Greek evidence Chandragupta was a follower of the sacrificial religion (see p. 246 *ante*). The epithet *Vṛishala* applied to him in the *Mudrārākshasa* suggests that in regard to certain matters he did deviate from strict orthodoxy (*Indian Culture*, II, No. 3, pp. 558 ff. See also C. J. Shah, *Jainism in Northern India*, 135n, 138).

[4] For the date of Chandragupta Maurya see *Indian Culture*, Vol. II, No. 3, pp. 560ff. Buddhist tradition of Ceylon puts the date 162 years after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, *i.e.*, in 382 B.C., if we take 544 B.C., to be the year of the Great Decease; and 324 B.C., if we prefer the Cantonese date 486 B.C., for the death of the Buddha. The earlier date is opposed to Greek evidence. The date 324 B.C. accords with the testimony of Greek writers.

If the *Pariśishṭaparvan*[1] of Hemachandra is to be believed Chandragupta had a queen named Durdharā who became the mother of Bindusāra, the son who succeeded him on the throne. In the absence of corroborative evidence, however, the name of the queen cannot be accepted as genuine.

SECTION II. THE REIGN OF BINDUSĀRA

Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded in or about the year 300 B.C. by his son Bindusāra Amitraghāta. The name or title *Amitraghāta* (slayer of foes) is a restoration in Sanskrit[2] of the Amitrachates of Athenaios, and Allitrochades of Strabo, who is stated to have been the son of Sandrocottus. Fleet prefers the rendering *Amitrakhāda* or devourer of enemies, which is said to occur as an epithet of Indra.[3] In the *Rājāvalīkathe* the name of Chandragupta's son and successor is given as Simhasena. From Aśoka's Rock Edict VIII (*e.g.* the Kālsī Text) it appears probable that Bindusāra, as well as other predecessors of Aśoka, used the style *Devānaṁpiya.*

The Jaina date, 313 B.C., for Chandragupta's accession, if it is based on a correct tradition, may refer to his acquisition of Avanti in Malwa, as the chronological datum is found in a verse where the Maurya king finds mention in a list of successors of Pālaka, king of Avanti. Cf. *IHQ*, 1929, p. 402. Filliozat (*Manuel des études indiennes*, I, 212-19) and others who prefer the late Jaina evidence, ignore the much earlier Ceylonese testimony, see Raychaudhuri, *HCIP*, *AIU*, Vol. II, 92ff; *ANM*, 136ff; the date 313 B.C. moreover does not accord well with what is known about the synchronism of *Aśoka* with some of the Hellenistic kings mentioned in Edict XIII, notably Magas of Cyrene whom a contemporary poet, Callimachus seems to place long before the Syrian War of Ptolemy III (c. 247-6 B.C.). Tarn in Cary, *Greek World*, 393 f.

[1] VIII 439-443. For another tradition see Bigandet, II. 128.

[2] *Cf.* Weber, *IA*, ii (1873), p. 148, Lassen and Cunningham (*Bhilsa Topes*, p. 92). The term *Amitraghāta* occurs in Patañjali's *Mahābhāshya* III. 2. 2. *Cf.*, also *Mbh*, 30. 19; 62. 8; VII. 22.16, where *Amitraghātin* occurs as an epithet of princes and warriors. Dr. Jarl Charpentier observes (in *Le Monde Oriental*, quoted in *Calcutta Review*, May-June, 1926, p. 399), "that the Greek word *Amitrachates* as a synonym of Bindusāra, should be rendered Amitraghāta seems clear not only from the *Mahābhāshya* but also from the royal title *amitrāṇāṁ hantā* in *Ait. Br.*, VIII. 17." In *JRAS*, 1928, January, however, he prefers to restore Amitrachates as Amitrakhāda (p. 135). Cf. *Ṛig-veda*, X. 152. 1.

[3] *JRAS*, 1909, p. 24.

If the author of the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī Mūla Kalpa*, Hemachandra and Tāranātha are to be believed, Kauṭilya or Chāṇakya continued to serve as minister for some time after the accession of Bindusāra.[1] "Chāṇakya" says Tāranātha, "one of his (Bindusāra's) great lords, procured the destruction of the nobles and kings of sixteen towns,[2] and made the king master of all the territory between the eastern and western seas." The conquest of the territory between the eastern and western seas has been taken by some scholars to refer to the annexation of the Deccan.[3] But we should not forget that already in the time of Chandragupta the Maurya Empire extended from Surāshṭra to Bengal (Gangaridae), *i.e.*, from the western to the eastern sea. Tāranātha's statement need mean nothing more than the suppression of a general revolt. No early tradition expressly connects the name of Bindusāra with the conquest of the Deccan.[4] The story of the subjugation of sixteen towns may or may not be true, but we are told in the *Divyāvadāna*[5] that at least one town of note, *viz.*, Taxila, revolted during the reign of Bindusāra. The king is said to have despatched Aśoka there. While the prince was nearing Taxila with his troops, the people came out to meet him, and said, "We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra, but the wicked ministers (*Dushṭāmātyāḥ*) insult us." The high-handedness of the Maurya officials in the outlying provinces is alluded to by Aśoka himself in his Kaliṅga Edict.[6] Addressing his *Mahāmātras* the Emperor says:

[1] Jacobi, *Pariśishṭaparvan*, p. 62; VIII. 446ff; *Ind. Ant.*, 1875, etc. For the alleged connection of Bindusāra and Chāṇakya with another minister named Subandhu, the author of the *Vāsavadattā Nāṭyadhārā*, see *Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference*, pp. 208-11 and *Pariśishṭa*, VIII. 447. The *Divyāvadāna* (p. 372) mentions Khallāṭaka as Bindusāra's *agrāmātya* or chief minister.

[2] Were these the capitals of the sixteen *mahājanapadas*?

[3] *Cf.* Smith, *EHI*, 3rd ed., p. 149, *JRAS*, 1919, 598; Jayaswal, *The Empire of Bindusāra*, *JBORS*, ii. 79 ff.

[4] See, however, Subramaṇiam, *JRAS*, 1923, p. 96, "My Guru's Guru had written in his commentary on a *Sangam* work that the Tulu-nāda was estab lished by the son of Chandragupta," perhaps Tuliyan (Tuli=Bindu).

[5] Cowell and Neil's Ed., p. 371.

[6] Smith, *Aśoka*, third edition, pp. 194-95.

"All men are my children: and, just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. *You, however, do not grasp this truth* to its full extent.[1] Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well established. Again, *it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture,* and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, *many other people are deeply grieved.* In such a case you must desire to do justice[2]..... and for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons (*Mahāmātras*) as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life, who knowing this my purpose will comply with my instructions.[3] From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials and will not over-pass three years. *In the same way from Taxila.*"

Taxila made its submission to Aśoka. The Maurya prince is further represented as entering the "Svaśa rājya" (**Khaśa** according to Burnouf).[4]

Foreign Relations

In his relations with the Hellenistic powers Bindusāra

[1] 'You do not learn how far this (my) object reaches." (Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, p. 95).

[2] "It happens in the administration (of justice) that a single person suffers either imprisonment or harsh treatment. In this case (an order) cancelling the imprisonment is (obtained) by him accidentally, while (many) other people continue to suffer. In this case you must strive to deal (with all of them) impartially." (Hultzsch, p. 96).

[3] "I shall send out every five years (a *Mahāmātra*) who will be neither harsh nor fierce, (but) of gentle actions (*viz.*, in order to ascertain) whether (the judicial officers) paying attention to this object ..are acting thus, as my instruction (implies)". (Hultzsch, p. 97).

[4] *Divyāvadāna*, p. 372. The emendation Khaśa is supported by the testimony of Tāranātha (*IHQ*, 1930, 334). For the Khaśas see *JASB*, (Extra No 2, 1899).

pursued a pacific policy. We learn from the classical writers[1] that the king of Syria despatched to his court an ambassador named Deïmachos. Pliny[2] tells us that (Ptolemy II) Philadelphos King of Egypt (B.C. 285-247), sent an envoy named Dionysios. Dr. Smith points out that it is uncertain whether Dionysios presented his credentials to Bindusāra or to his son and successor, Aśoka. It is, however, significant that while Greek and Latin writers refer to Chandragupta and Amitraghāta they do not mention Aśoka. This is rather inexplicable if an envoy whose writings were utilized by later authors, really visited the third of the great Mauryas. Patrokles,[3] an officer who served under both Seleukos and his son, sailed in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochos (I, Soter), king of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that the Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told on the authority of Hegesander that Amitrochates (Bindusāra), the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs, and a sophist, and Antiochos replied: We shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold.[4] In connection with the demand for a Greek sophist it is interesting to recall the statement of Diodoros that one Iamboulos was carried to the king of Palibothra (Pāṭaliputra) who *had a great love for the Graecians.* Dion Chrysostom asserts that the poetry of Homer is sung by the Indians who had translated it into their own language and modes of expression.[5] Garga and Varāhamihira in a

[1] E.g., *Strabo.*

[2] McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, p. 108.

[3] Smith, *Aśoka*, third edition, p. 19.

[4] McCrindle, *Inv. Alex.*, p. 409. Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, p. xxxv. Bindusāra's interest in philosophy is also proved by his association with Ajīva-parivrājakas, *Divyāvadāna*, 370ff. *Cf.*, also the first lines of Pillar Edict VII.

[5] McCrindle, *Ancient India*, p. 177. *Cf.* Grote, XII. p. 169, *possible* representation of a Greek drama on the Hydaspes.

later age testify to the honour that was paid to Greeks for their knowledge of astronomy.[1]

Bindusāra's Family

Bindusāra had many children besides Aśoka, the son who succeeded him on the throne. We learn from a passage of the Fifth Rock Edict in which the duties of the *Dharma-mahāmātras*[2] are described, that Aśoka had many brothers and sisters. The *Divyāvadāna* mentions two of these brothers, namely, Susīma and Vigataśoka.[3] The Ceylonese Chronicles seem also to refer to these two princes though under different names, calling the former Sumana and the latter Tishya. Susīma-Sumanā is said to have been the eldest son of Bindusāra and a step-brother of Aśoka, while Vigataśoka-Tishya is reputed to have been the youngest son of Bindusāra and a co-uterine brother of Aśoka, born of a Brāhmaṇa girl from Champā.[4] Hiuen Tsang mentions a brother of Aśoka named Mahendra. Ceylonese tradition, however, represents the latter as a son of Aśoka. It is possible that the Chinese pilgrim has confounded the story of Vigataśoka with that of Mahendra.[5]

Bindusāra died after a reign of 25 years according to the *Purāṇas* and 27 or 28 years according to Buddhist tradition.[6] According to the chronology adopted in these pages his reign terminated about 273 B.C.[7]

[1] *Bṛhat Saṁhitā*. II, 14. Aristoxenus and Eusebius refer to the presence in Athens, as early as the fourth century B.C., of Indians who discussed philosophy with Socrates. (A note by Rawlinson quoted in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 22.11.36, p. 17).

[2] "High Officers for the Establishment and Propagation of the Law of Duty."

[3] Pp. 369-73; Smith, *Aśoka*, 3rd ed., pp. 247 ff.

[4] According to R. L. Mitra (*Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, 8) and Smith the name of Aśoka's mother was Subhadrāṅgī. Bigandet II. 128, mentions Dhammā as the mother of Aśoka and Tissa.

[5] *Cf.* Smith, *Aśoka*, 3rd ed., p. 257.

[6] Hultzsch points out (p. xxxii) that Burmese tradition assigns 27 years to Bindusāra, while Buddhaghosha's *Samanta-pāsādikā* agrees with the *Mahāvaṁsa* in allotting 28 years to that king.

[7] *Cf.* Smith, *Aśoka*, p. 73.

Section III. The Early Years of Aśoka

Both the *Divyāvadāna* and the Ceylonese Chronicles agree that there was a **fratricidal struggle** after the death of Bindusāra. Aśoka is said to have overthrown his eldest step-brother with the help of Rādhagupta whom he made his *Agrāmātya* (Chief Minister). Dr. Smith observes,[1] "the fact that his formal consecration or coronation (*abhisheka*) was delayed for some four years[2] until 269 B.C.,[3] confirms the tradition that his succession was contested, and it may be true that his rival was an elder brother named Susīma." In his *Aśoka*[4] published a few months later, he says, "it is possible that the long delay may have been due to a disputed succession involving much bloodshed, but there is no independent evidence of such a struggle." Dr. Jayaswal[5] gave the following explanation for the delay in Aśoka's coronation: "it seems that in those days for obtaining royal *abhisheka*[6] the age of 25 was a condition precedent. This seems to explain why Aśoka was not crowned for three or four years after accession". The contention can hardly be accepted. The *Mahābhārata*, for instance, informs us that the *abhisheka* of king Vichitravīrya took place when he was a mere child who had not yet reached the period of youth:

[1] *The Oxford History of India*, p. 93.

[2] *Mahāvaṁsa*, Geiger's translation, p. 28.

[3] For the date of Aśoka, *see in the History and Culture of Indian People*, Vol. II. 92ff; for the views of Eggerment, *Acta Orientalia* (1940), 103ff. For the views of Filliozat, see *Manuel des études indiennes*, Vol. I, pp. 212-19. Filliozat prefers the Jaina date 313 B.C. for the accession of Chandragupta, ignoring not only the evidence of the Ceylonese Chronicles but also the fact that the Jaina verses refer to the commencement of Maurya rule in Avanti, not in Magadha or the Indus Valley. For the date of Magas, *see* also Cary, *A History of the Greek World*, 393ff.

[4] Third edition

[5] *JBORS*, 1917, p. 438

[6] There were other kinds of *abhisheka* also, *e.g.*, those of *Yuvarāja*, *Kumāra*, and *Senāpati*, as we learn from the epics and the Kauṭilīya (trans., pp. 377, 391).

Vichitravīryañcha tadā
bālaṁ aprāptayauvanam
Kururājye mahābāhur
abhyashiñchadanantaram.[1]

Dr. Smith characterises[2] the Ceylonese tales which relate that Aśoka slew many of his brothers as silly because Aśoka certainly had brothers and sisters alive in the seventeenth and eighteenth years of his reign whose households were objects of his anxious care. But we should remember that the Fifth Rock Edict refers only to the family establishments of his brothers (*olodhanesu bhātinaṁ*) as existing. This does not necessarily imply that the brothers themselves were alive. We should however, admit that there is nothing to show, on the contrary, that the brothers were dead. The Fifth Rock Edict, in our opinion, proves nothing regarding the authenticity or untrustworthiness of the Ceylonese tradition. In the Fourth Rock Edict Aśoka himself testifies to the growth of unseemly behaviour to kinsfolk and slaughter of living creatures.

The first four years of Aśoka's reign is, to quote the words which Dr. Smith uses in another connection, "one of the dark spaces in the spectrum of Indian history; vague speculation, unchecked by the salutary limitations of verified fact, is at the best, unprofitable".

Like his predecessors[3] Aśoka assumed the title of *Devānaṁpiya*. He generally described himself as *Devānaṁpiya Piyadasi*.[4] The name Aśoka is found only in

[1] *Mbh*, I. 101. 12. As the *Adiparva* refers to Dattāmitra and *Yavana* rule in the lower Indus valley its date cannot be far removed from that of Aśoka and Khāravela. *Cf.* also the cases of Samprati *Pariśishṭa parvan*, IX. 52, who was anointed king though a baby in arms, and of Amma II, Eastern Chalukya

[2] *EHI*, 3rd ed., p. 155.

[3] *Cf.* Rock Edict VIII, Kālsī, Shāhbāzgarhi and Mānsahra Texts.

[4] We have already seen that the epithet "*Piadaṁsana*" is sometimes applied to Chandragupta also (Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, p. 5, Hultzsch, CII, Vol I, p. xxx).

literature, and in two ancient inscriptions, *viz.*, the Māski Edict of Aśoka himself, and the Junāgaḍh inscription of the *Mahākshatrapa* Rudradāman I. The name Dharmāśoka is found in one Mediaeval epigraph, *viz.*, the Sārnāth inscription of Kumāradevī.[1]

During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka seems to have carried on the traditional Maurya policy of expansion within India, and of friendly co-operation with the foreign powers, which was in vogue after the Seleukidan war. Like Chandragupta and Bindusāra he was aggressive at home but pacific abroad. The friendly attitude towards non-Indian powers is proved by the exchange of embassies and the employment of *Yavana* officials like Tushāspha.[2] In India, however, he played the part of a conqueror. The *Divyāvadāna* credits him, while yet a prince with the suppression of a revolt in Taxila and the conquest of the Svaśa (Khaśa?) country. In the thirteenth year of his reign (eight years after consecration), he effected the **conquest of Kaliṅga.** We do not know the exact limits of this kingdom in the days of Aśoka. But if the Sanskrit epics and *Purāṇas* are to be believed, it extended to the river Vaitaraṇī in the north,[3] the Amarakaṇṭaka Hills in the west[4] and Mahendragiri in the south.[5]

An account of the Kaliṅga war and its effects is given in Rock Edict XIII. We have already seen that certain places in Kaliṅga formed parts of the Magadhan dominions in the time of the Nandas. Why was it necessary for Aśoka to reconquer the country? The question admits of only one answer, *viz.*, that it severed its connection with Magadha after the fall of the Nandas. If the story of a general revolt in the time of Bindusāra be correct then it is not unlikely that Kaliṅga, like Taxila, threw

[1] *Dharmāśoka-narādhipasya samaye Śrī Dharmachakro Jino yādṛik tannaya-rakshitaḥ punarayañchakre tatopyadbhutam.*

[2] Note also the part played by the Yona named Dhammarakkhita (*Mahāvaṁsa*, trans., p. 82).

[3] *Mbh*, III. 114. 4.

[4] *Kūrma Purāṇa*, 11, 39. 9. *Vāyu*, 77. 4-13.

[5] *Raghuvaṁśa*, IV, 38-43; VI, 53-54.

off the allegiance of Magadha during the reign of that monarch. It appears, however, from Pliny, who probably based his account on the *Indika* of Megasthenes, that Kaliṅga was already an independent kingdom in the time of Chandragupta. In that case there can be no question of a revolt in the time of Bindusāra. Pliny says,[1] "the tribes called Calingae are nearest the sea.... the royal city of the Calingae is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1,000 horsemen, 700 elephants keep watch and ward in 'procinct of war'."[2]

The Kaliṅga kings probably increased their army considerably during the period which elapsed from the time of Megasthenes to that of Aśoka, because during the war with Aśoka the casualties exceeded 2,50,000. It is, however, possible that the huge total included not only combatants but also non-combatants. The existence of a powerful kingdom so near their borders, with a big army 'in procinct of war,' could not be a matter of indifference to the kings of Magadha. Magadha learnt to her cost what a powerful Kaliṅga meant, in the time of Khāravela.

We learn from the Thirteenth Rock Edict that Aśoka made war on the Kaliṅga country and annexed it to his empire. "One hundred and fifty thousand persons were carried away captive, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times that number died." Violence, slaughter,

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1877, p. 338.

[2] If, as is probable, Kaliṅga included at that time the neighbouring country of Aśmaka, then Parthalis may be the same as "Potali". For an interesting account of Kaliṅga and its early capitals Dantakūra and Tosali, *see* Sylvain Lévi, "*Pré-Aryen et Pré-Dravidien dans l'Inde,*" J. A. Juillet-Septembre, 1923; and *Indian Antiquary*, 1926 (May), pp. 94, 98. "The appellation of Kaliṅga, applied to Indians throughout the Malay world, attests the brilliant *rôle* of the men of Kaliṅga in the diffusion of Hindu civilisation." Not far from the earliest capital (Paloura-Dantapura-Dantakūra) lay the *apheterion*, "where vessels bound for the Golden Peninsula ceased to hug the shore and sailed for the open sea." Note, in this connection, the name Ho-ling (Po-ling, Kaliṅga) applied by the Chinese to Java (Takakusu, I-tsing, p. xlvii) an island which was known by its Sanskrit name to Ptolemy (150 A.D.) and even to the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*Kishk.* 40, 30). For the connection of early Kaliṅga with Ceylon, *see* IA, VIII. 2, 225.

and separation from their beloved ones befell not only to combatants, but also to the *Brāhmaṇas,* ascetics, and householders.

The conquered territory was constituted a viceroyalty under a prince of the royal family stationed at Tosalī,[1] apparently situated in the Purī district. The Emperor issued two special edicts prescribing the principles on which both the settled inhabitants and the border tribes should be treated. These two edicts are preserved at two sites, now called Dhauli[2] and Jaugaḍa.[3] They are addressed to the *Mahāmātras* or High Officers at Tosalī and Samāpā.[4] In these documents the Emperor makes the famous declaration "all men are my children", and charges his officers to see that justice is done to the people.

The conquest of Kaliṅga was a great landmark in the history of Magadha, and of India. It marks the close of that career of conquest and aggrandisement which was ushered in by Bimbisāra's annexation of Aṅga. It opens a new era—an era of peace, of social progress, of religious propaganda and at the same time of political stagnation and, perhaps, of military inefficiency during which the martial spirit of imperial Magadha was dying out for want of exercise. The era of military conquest or *Digvijaya*[5] was over, the era of spiritual conquest or *Dhamma-vijaya* was about to begin.

We should pause here to give an account of the **extent of Aśoka's dominions** and the manner in which they

[1] Toasalī (variant Tosala) was the name of a country as well as a city Lévi points out that the *Gaṇḍavyūha,* refers to the country (*Janapada*) of *Amita-Tosala* in the *Dakshiṇāpatha,* "where stands a city named Tosala". In Brāhmaṇical literature Tosala is constantly associated with (South) Kosala and is sometimes distinguished from Kaliṅga. The form Tosalei occurs in the Geography of Ptolemy. Some mediaeval inscriptions (*Ep Ind.,* IX. 286, XV. 3) refer to *Dakshiṇa* (South) Tosala and *Uttara* (North) Tosala.

[2] In Purī

[3] In Gañjam.

[4] For the identification of *Samāpā,* see *Ind. Ant.,* 1923, pp. 66 ff.

[5] Cf. *sara-sake vijaye* (Bühler, cited in Hultzsch's *Inscriptions of Aśoka,* p. 25)

were administered before the Emperor embarked on a new policy.

Aśoka mentions Magadha, Pāṭaliputra, Khalatikapavata (Barābar Hills), Kosaṁbī, Luṁmini-gāma, Kaliṅga (including Tosalī, Samāpā and Khepiṁgalapavata or the Jaugaḍa Rock), Aṭavi (the forest tract of Mid-India perhaps identical with Ālavī of the Buddhist texts), Suvarṇagiri, Isila, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā expressly as being among those places which were under his rule.

Beyond Takshaśilā the empire stretched as far as the confines of the realm of "*Aṁtiyako Yonarājā*", usually identified with Antiochos II Theos of Syria (261-246 B.C.), and included the wide territory round Shāhbāzgarhi[1] and Mānsahra[2] inhabited by the Yonas, Kambojas and the Gandhāras. The exact situation of this **Yona** territory has not yet been determined. The *Mahāvaṁsa* evidently refers to it and its chief city Alasanda which Cunningham and Geiger identify with the town of Alexandria (Begram, west of Kāpiśa) founded by the Macedonian conqueror near Kābul.[3] **Kamboja,** as we have already seen, corresponds to Rājapura or Rajaur near Punch in Kaśmīra and some neighbouring tracts including Kāfiristān. The tribal territory of the **Gandhāras** at this time probably lay to the west of the Indus, and did not apparently include Takshaśilā which was ruled by a princely Viceroy, and was the capital of the province of Uttarāpatha.[4] The capital of Trans-Indian Gandhāra was Pushkarāvatī, identified by Coomaraswamy with the site known as Mīr Ziyārat or Balâ Hisār at the junction of the Swāt and Kābul rivers.[5]

The inclusion of **Kaśmīra** within Aśoka's empire is

[1] In the Peshawār District.

[2] In the Hazāra District.

[3] Cunn. *AGI* 18 Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, 194 The Yona territory probably corresponds to the whole or a part of the Province of the *Paropamisadae*.

[4] *Cf* Kaliṅga Edict; *Divyāvadāna*, p. 407, *Rājño'śokasy-ottarāpathe Takshaśilā nagaraṁ*, etc.

[5] Cf. *Carm. Lec.*, 1918, p 54, *Indian and Indonesian Art*, 55.

proved by the testimony of Hiuen Tsang's *Records*[1] and Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[2] Kalhaṇa says: "The faithful Aśoka reigned over the earth. This king who had freed himself from sins and had embraced the doctrine of the *Jina* covered Śushkaletra and Vitastātra with numerous *Stūpas*. At the town of Vitastātra there stood within the precincts of the *Dharmāraṇya Vihāra* a *Chaitya* built by him, the height of which could not be reached by the eye. That illustrious king built the town of Śrīnagarī. This sinless prince after removing the old stuccoed enclosure of the shrine of *Vijayeśvara* built in its stead a new one of stone. He .... erected within the enclosure of *Vijayeśa*, and near it, two temples which were called *Aśokeśvara*." The description of Aśoka as a follower of the *Jina*, i.e., *Buddha*, and the builder of numerous *stūpas* leaves no room for doubt that the great Maurya monarch is meant. We are told by Kalhaṇa himself that he is indebted for much of the above account to an earlier chronicler named Chhavillākara.

The inscriptions near Kālsī and those on the Rummindeī and the Nigāli Sāgar pillars prove the inclusion of the Dehra-Dūn District and the Tarāi within the limits of Aśoka's Empire, while the monuments at Lalitapātan and Rāmpurwā attest his possession of the valley of Nepāl and the district of Champāran. Further evidence of the inclusion of the **Himalayan region** within Aśoka's empire is possibly furnished by Rock Edict XIII which refers to the Nābhapaṁtis of Nābhaka, probably identical with Na-pei-kea of Fa Hien,[3] the birthplace of Krakuchchhanda Buddha, about 10 miles south or south-west of Kapilavastu.[4]

[1] Watters, Vol I, pp 267 71

[2] I 102 06

[3] Legge, 64.

[4] "The *Brahma* (*vaivarta*?) *Purāṇa* assigns Nābhikapura to the territory of the Uttara-Kurus" (Hultzsch, CII, Vol I, p. xxxix n). Mr. M. Govinda Pai (*Aiyangar Com Vol* 36), however, invites attention to the Nabhakānanas, apparently a southern people, mentioned in the *Mbh*. vi. 9. 59. In connection with the northern limits of the Maurya empire attention may also be invited to the statement in the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 372) about Aśoka's subjuga-

According to Bühler, Rock Edict XIII also mentions two vassal tribes Viśa (Besatae of the *Periplus*?) and Vajri (Vṛijikas?). More recent writers do not accept Bühler's reading and substitute (*Rāja*) *Visayamhi*, 'in the (king's) territory', in its place. There is, thus no indubitable reference either to the Vṛijikas or the 'Besatae' in the inscriptions of Aśoka.

We learn from the classical writers that the country of the **Gangaridae,** i.e., Bengal,[1] formed a part of the dominions of the king of the Prasii, *i.e.*, Magadha, as early as the time of Agrammes, *i.e.*, the last Nanda king.[2] A passage of Pliny clearly suggests that the "Palibothri," *i.e.*, the rulers of Pātalīputra, dominated the whole tract along the Ganges.[3] That the Magadhan kings retained their hold on Bengal as late as the time of Aśoka is suggested by the testimony of the *Divyāvadāna*[4] and of Hiuen Tsang who saw *Stūpas* of that monarch near Tāmralipti and Karṇasuvarṇa (in West Bengal), in Samataṭa (East Bengal) as well as in Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal). Kāmarūpa (Assam) seems to have lain outside the empire. The Chinese pilgrim saw no monument of Aśoka in that country.

We have seen that in the south the Maurya power at one time, had probably penetrated as far as the Podiyil

tion of the Svaśa (Khaśa?) country According to a legend narrated by the Chinese pilgrims (Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II. p 295) exiles from Takshaśilā settled in the land to the east of Khoten in the days of Aśoka.

[1] For early references to Vaṅga, *see* Lévi *"Pré-Aryen et Pré-Dravidien dans l'Inde"* For its denotation, see *Mānasī-o-Marmavāṇī*, Srāvaṇa, 1336 Several scholars find it mentioned in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*. But this is doubtful. Bodhāyana brands it as an impure country and even Patañjali excludes it from *Āryāvarta* The country was, however, Aryanised before the *Manusaṁhitā* which extends the eastern boundary of Āryāvarta to the sea, and the Jain *Prajñāpanā* which ranks Aṅga and Vaṅga in the first group of Aryan peoples. The earliest epigraphic reference to Vaṅga is probably that contained in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscriptions.

[2] McCrindle, *Inv. Alex*., pp. 221, 281.

[3] *Ind Ant.*, 1877, 339. *Megasthenes and Arrian* (1926), pp. 141-2.

[4] P 427. *Cf* Smith's *Aśoka*, 3rd ed., p 255 The Mahāsthāna Inscription which is usually attributed to the Maurya period, contains no reference to Aśoka

Hill in the Tinnevelly district.[1] In the time of Aśoka the Maurya frontier had receded probably to the Pennār river near Nellore as the Tamil Kingdoms are referred to as "*Prachaṁta*" or border states and are clearly distinguished from the imperial dominions (*Vijita* or *Rāja-vishaya*), which stretched only as far south as the Chitaldrug District of Mysore. The major part of the Deccan was ruled by the viceregal princes of **Suvarṇagiri**[2] and **Tosali**, the *Mahāmātras* of Isila and Samāpā and the officers in charge of the **Atavi** or Forest Country.[3] But in the belt of land on either side of the Nerbudda, the Godāvarī and the upper Mahānadī there were, in all probability, certain areas that were technically outside the limits of the empire proper. Aśoka evidently draws a distinction between the forests and the inhabiting tribes which are in the dominions (*vijita*) and peoples on the border (*antā avijitā*) for whose benefit some of the *special* edicts were issued. Certain vassal tribes are specifically mentioned, *e.g.*, the Andhras, Palidas (Pāladas, Pāriṁdas), Bhojas and Raṭhikas (Risṭikas, Rāshṭrikas?). They enjoyed a status midway between the Provincials proper and the unsubdued borderers. The word Petenika or Pitinika mentioned in Rock Edicts V and XIII should not, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and some other writers, be read as a separate name but as an adjective qualifying Rishṭika (Edict V) and Bhoja (Edict XIII). They draw our attention to certain

[1] Mr. S S. Desikar thinks that the last point reached by the Mauryas was the Veṅkaṭa hill (*IHQ*, 1928, p. 154), Prof. N. Sastri lays stress (*ANM*, pp. 253ff.) on the legendary features of the account in Tamil texts.

[2] A clue to the location of this city is probably given by the inscriptions of the later Mauryas of the Koṅkaṇ and Khāndesh, apparently the descendants of the Southern Viceroy (*Ep. Ind.*, III. 136). As these later Maurya inscriptions have been found at Vāda in the north of the Thāṇa district (*Bomb Gaz*, Vol. I, Part II, p 14) and at Wāghlī in Khāndesh (*ibid.*, 284), it is not unlikely that Suvarṇagiri was situated in that neighbourhood Curiously enough, there is actually in Khāndesh a place called Songir. According to Hultzsch, (*CII.* p. xxxviii) Suvarṇagiri is perhaps identical with Kanakagiri in the Hyderabad State, south of Maski, and north of the ruins of Vijayanagara. Isila may have been the ancient name of Siddāpura.

[3] Edict XIII.

passages in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*[1] where the term *Pettanika* occurs in the sense of one who enjoys property given by his father.[2] The view that *Pitinika* is merely an adjective of Raṭhika (Risṭika) or Bhoja is not, however, accepted by Dr. Barua who remarks that "it is clear from the Pāli passage, as well as from Buddhaghosha's explanations, that *Raṭṭhika* and *Pettanika* were two different designations."

The **Andhras** are, as we have already seen, mentioned in a passage of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. The **Bhojas** are also mentioned in that work as rulers of the south.[3] Pliny, quoting probably from Megasthenes says that the Andarae (Andhras) possessed numerous villages, thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and supplied their king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 1,000 elephants.[4] The earliest Andhra capital (Andhapura) was situated on the Telavāha river which, according to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, is either the modern Tel or Telingiri, both flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. But the identification is by no means certain.[5] The Palidas

[1] III. 76, 78 and 300 (P.T.S.).

[2] *Ind. Ant.*, 1919, p. 80. *Cf.* Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, 10; *IHQ*, 1925, 387. Other scholars, however, identify the Pitinikas with the Paiṭhānakas or natives of Paiṭhan, and some go so far as to suggest that they are the ancestors of the Sātavāhana rulers of Paiṭhan. See Woolner, *Aśoka Text and Glossary*, II, 113; also *JRAS*, 1923, 92. *Cf.* Barua, *Old Brāhmī Ins.*, p. 211.

[3] For other meanings of Bhoja, see *Mbh.*, Ādi., 84, 22; IA, V. 177, VI. 25-28; VII. 36, 254.

[4] *Ind. Ant.*, 1877, p. 339.

[5] P. 92 *ante*. In historical times the Andhras are found in possession of the Kṛishṇā and Gauṇṭūr districts as we learn from the Mayidavolu plates and other records. The earliest capital of the Andhra-country or "Andhrāpatha" known from the inscriptions is apparently Dhaṁñakaḍa at or near Amarāvati (or Bezvāḍa). Kubiraka of the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscription (*c.* 200 B.C) is the earliest known ruler. One recension, in the *Brāhmī* script, of the Rock Edicts of Aśoka, has recently been discovered in the Kurnool District (*IHQ*, 1928, 791; 1931, 817ff.; 1933, 113ff.; *IA*, Feb., 1932, p. 39) which falls within the "Andhra" area of the Madras Presidency. Recent discoveries of the Aśokan epigraphs include, besides the Yerraguḍi inscriptions (Kurnool District) two new Rock Edicts at Kopbal in the South-West corner of the Hyderabad State. The Kopbal inscriptions are found on the Gavīmaṭh and the Pālkiguṇḍu Hills. They belong to the class of Minor Rock Edicts.

were identified by Bühler with the **Pulindas**[1] who are invariably associated with the Nerbudda (Revā) and the Vindhyan region:—

Pulinda-rāja sundarī nābhimaṇḍala nipīta salilā (Revā).[2]

Pulindā Vindhya Pushikā(?) Vaidarbhā Dandakaih saha[3]

Pulindā Vindhya Mūlikā Vaidarbhā Dandakaih saha[4]

Their capital Pulinda-nagara lay not far from Bhilsā and may have been identical with Rūpnāth, the find-spot of one recension of Minor Rock Edict I.[5]

Hultzsch, however, doubts the identification of the "Palidas" of Shahbazgarhi with the Pulindas, for the Kālsī and Girnār texts have the variants Pālada and Pārimda—names that remind us of the **Pāradas** of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*,[6] the *Harivaṁśa*[7] and the *Bṛihat Saṁhita*.[8] In those texts the people in question are mentioned in a list of barbarous tribes along with the Śakas, Yavanas, Kambojas, Pahlavas, Khaśas, Māhishikas, Cholas, Keralas, etc. They are described as *muktakeśā* ("having dishevelled hair"). Some of the tribes mentioned in the list belong to the north, others to the south. The association with the Andhras in Aśokan inscriptions suggests that in the Maurya period they may have been in the Deccan. But the matter must be regarded as not definitely settled. It is interesting to note in this connection that a river Pāradā (identified with the Paradi or Par river in the Surat District) is mentioned in a Nāsik inscription.[9]

[1] Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, 48 (n 14)

[2] Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā*.

[3] *Mastsya*, p. 114, 48.

[4] *Vāyu*, 55, 126.

[5] The Navagrāma grant of the *Mahāraja* Hastin of the year 198 (A.D. 517) refers to a Pulinda-rāja-rashtra which lay in the territory of the Parivrājaka kings, *i.e.*, in the Dabbālā region in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradesh (*Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 126).

[6] Ch. 88, 128. *Cf* Paradene in Gedrosia (McCrindle, *Ptolemy*, 1927), 320.

[7] I, 14.

[8] XIII, 9.

[9] Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, lvi Pargiter places the Pāradas in the north-west, *AIHT*, p 268 *Cf*. Paradene, Gedrosia (*Ptolemy*, ed. 1927) 320 and Paraitakai, *Ind. Alex.*, 44.

The **Bhojas** and the **Rathikas** (Risṭikas) were evidently the ancestors of the Mahābhojas and the Mahāraṭhis of the Sātavāhana period.[1] The Bhojas apparently dwelt in Berar,[2] and the Raṭhikas or Risṭikas possibly in Mahārāshṭra or certain adjoining tracts.[3] The former were, in later ages, connected by matrimonial alliances with chieftains of the Kanarese country.

In the west Aśoka's Empire extended to the Arabian Sea and embraced all the **Aparāntas**[4] including no doubt, the vassal state (or confederation of states) of Surāshṭra the affairs of which were looked after by the *Yavana-rāja* Tushāspha with Giri-nagara (Girnar) as his capital. Dr. Smith says that the form of the name shows that the *Yavana-rāja* must have been a Persian. But according to this interpretation the *Yavana* Dhammadeva, the *Śaka* Ushavadāta (Ṛisahabha-datta), the *Parthian Suviśākha* and the *Kushān* Vāsudeva must have been all native Hindus of India. If Greeks and other foreigners adopted Hindu names there is no wonder that some of them assumed Irāṇic appellations. There is, then, no good ground for assuming that Tushāspha was not a Greek, but a Persian.[5]

Rapson[6] seems to think that the Gandhāras, Kambojas, Yavanas, Rishṭikas, Bhojas, Petenikas, Pāladas and Andhras lay beyond Aśoka's dominions, and were not his subjects, though regarded as coming within his sphere of influence. But this surmise can hardly be accepted in view of the fact that Aśoka's *Dharma-mahāmātras* were employed amongst them "on the revision of (sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of)

[1] Smith, *Aśoka*, third ed., pp. 169-70.

[2] *Cf.* Bhoja-kata, Bhāt kuli in Amraoti.

[3] The *Rāmāyana*, IV. 41. 10, places the Rishṭikas between the Vidarbhas of (Berar) and the Māhishakas of the Nerbudda valley or of Mysore *Rathīka* is also used as an official designation and it is in that sense that the expression seems to be used in the Yerraguḍi inscription (*Ind. Culture*, I, 310; *Aiyangar Com. Vol.* 35. *IHQ*, 1933, 117).

[4] Śūrpāraka, Nāsik, etc., according to the *Mārkaṇḍeya*, p 57, 49, 52

[5] Cf. *IA*, 1919, 145; *EHVS*, 2nd ed., 28-29.

[6] *CHI*, pp. 514, 515.

release" (Rock Edict V).[1] In the Rock Edict XIII, they seem to be included within the *Rāja-Vishaya* or the King's territory, and are distinguished from the real border peoples (*Anta, Prachanta*), *viz.*, the Greeks of the realm of Antiochos and the Tamil peoples of the south (*Nīcha*). But while we are unable to accept the views of Rapson, we find it equally difficult to agree with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar[2] who denies the existence of Yonas and others as feudatory chieftains in Aśoka's dominions. The case of the *Yavana-rāja* Tushāspha clearly establishes the existence of such vassal chiefs whose peoples undoubtedly enjoyed partial autonomy though subject to the jurisdiction of special Imperial officers like the *Dharma-mahāmātras*.

Having described the extent of Aśoka's empire we now proceed to give a brief account of its **administration.** Aśoka continued the Council government of his predecessors. There are references to the Emperor's dealings with the *Parishā* or *Parisha* in Rock Edicts III and VI. Senart took *Parishad* to mean *Saṅgha* and Bühler understood by it the Committee of caste or sect. But Dr. K. P. Jayaswal pointed out that the *Parishā* of the Edicts is *Mantriparishad* of the *Arthaśāstra*.[3] The inscriptions prove that Aśoka retained also the system of Provincial Government existing under his forefathers. Tosalī, Suvarṇagiri, Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā were each under a prince of the blood (*Kumāla* or *Ayaputa*).[4]

[1] "They are occupied in supporting prisoners (with money), in causing (their) fetters to be taken off, and in setting (them) free" (Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, p. 33).

[2] *Aśoka*, 28.

[3] Compare the references to the "*Saraphā Parishā*" in the *Mahāvastu*, Senart, Vol. III, pp. 362, 392. For different kinds of *Parishā*, see *Aṅguttara*, i. 70

[4] That *Ayaputa* or *Āryaputra* meant a member of a ruling house of clan appears probable from the evidence of the *Bālacharita*, attributed to Bhāsa, in which Vasudeva is addressed by a *Bhaṭa* as Āryaputra. Pandit T. Ganapati Śāstrī further points out that in the *Svapnanāṭaka* the term Āryaputra is employed as a word of respect by the chamberlain of Vāsavadattā's father in addressing King Udayana (*Introduction to the Pratimā-nāṭaka*, p. 32). An interesting feature of Aśoka's administration was the employment of a Yavana

The Empire and the Princes were helped by bodies (*Nikāyā*) of officials who fell under the following classes: —

1. The *Māhāmātras*[1] and other *Mukhyas*.
2-3. The *Rājūkas* and the *Raṭhıkas*.
4. The *Pradeśikas* or *Prādeśikas*.
5. The *Yutas*.[2]
6. *Pulisā*.
7. *Paṭıvedakā*.
8. *Vachabhūmikā*.
9. The *Lipikaras*.
10. The *Dūtas*.
11-12. The *Āyuktas* and *Kāranakas*.

There was a body of *Mahāmātras* in each great city and district of the empire.[3] The inscriptions mention the *Mahāmātras* of Pāṭaliputra, Kauśāmbī, Tosalī, Samāpā, Suvarṇagiri and Isila[4] In the Kaliṅga Edicts we have certain *Mahāmātras* distinguished by the terms *Nagalaka* and *Nagala-Viyohālaka*. The Nagalaka and Nagala-Viyohālaka of the Edicts correspond to the *Nāgaraka* and *Paura-vyāvahārıka* of the *Arthaśāstra*[5] and no doubt

governor or *episkopos* in one territory to which reference has already been made.

[1] *Cf.* also *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 16, 20, 58, 64, 215, 237-39; Rājaśekhara, *KM*, XLV, 53.

[2] The *Yuktas* of the *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 59. 65, 199 *Rāmāyaṇa*, VI, 217, 34; *Mahābhārata*, II, 56, 18, *Manu*, VIII. 34; *cf.* the *Rāja-yuktas* of the *Śāntıparva*, 82. 9-15.

[3] The empire, as already stated, was divided into a number of provinces (*diśā*, *deśa*, etc.). Each province seems to have been further subdivided into *āhālas* or districts under regular civil administration, and *koṭṭa-vishayas* or territories surrounding forts (Hultzsch, p. xl). Each civil administrative division had a *pura* or *nagara* (city) and a rural part called *janapada* which consisted of *grāmas* or villages. An important official in each *janapada* was the *Rājūka*. The designations *Prādeśika* and *Raṭhıka* possibly suggest the existence of territorial units styled *pradeśa* and *raṭṭha* or *rāshṭra*.

[4] *Mahāmātras* of Śrāvastī are according to certain scholars, mentioned in the Sohgaura copperplate inscription found in a village on the Rāptī, not far from Gorakhpur. But the exact date of the record is not known (Hoernle, *JASB*, 1894; 84; Fleet, *JRAS*, 1907, 523ff.; Barua, *Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, xi, 1 (1930), 32ff.; *IHQ*, 1934, 54ff.; Jayaswal, *Ep. Ind.*, xxii, 2).

[5] P. 29, 143f. *Cf.* the royal *epistates* or city governor in the Antigonid realm (Tarn., *GBI*, 24).

administered justice in cities.[1] In Pillar Edict I mention is made of the *Aṁta Mahāmātras* or the Wardens of the Marches, who correspond to the *Antapālas* of the *Arthaśāstra*[2] and the *Goptṛis* of the age of Skanda Gupta. The *Kauṭilīya* tells us that the salary of an *Antapāla* was equal to that of a *Kumāra*, a *Paura-vyāvahārika*, a member of the *Mantriparishad* or a *Rāshṭrapāla*.[3] In Edict XII mention is made of the *Ithījhaka Mahāmātras* who, doubtless, correspond to the *Stry-adhyakshas* (the Guards of the Ladies) of the epics.[4]

As to the *Rājūkas*, Dr. Smith takes the word to mean a governor next below a *Kumāra*.[5] Bühler identifies the *Rājuka* of the Aśokan inscriptions with the *Rajjūka* or the *Rajjugāhaka Amachcha* (Rope-holder, Field-measurer or Surveyor) of the *Jātakas*.[6] Pillar Edict IV refers to the *Rājūkas* as officers 'set over many hundred thousands of people," and charged with the duty of promoting the welfare of the *Jānapadas* to whom Aśoka granted independence in the award of honours and penalties. The reference to the award of penalties (*Daṇḍa*) probably indicates that the *Rājūkas* had judicial duties. In the Rock Edict III as well as in Pillar Edict IV they are associated with the *Yutas*, and in the Yerraguḍi inscriptions with the *Rathikas*.[7] Strabo[8] refers to a class of Magistrates (*Agronomoi*) who "have the care of the rivers, measure the land, as in Egypt, have charge also of hunters

[1] *Cf.* also *Nagara-dhānya Vyāvahārika*, p 55 The *Nagalaka* may have had executive functions as well, as is suggested by the evidence of the *Artha-śāstra* (II. Ch. 36).

[2] Pp. 20, 247. [3] P. 247

[4] *Rām.*, II. 16. 3, *Vṛiddhan vetrapanin . stryadhyakshān*; *Mbh*, IX. 29. 68, 90; XV 22, 20; 23, 12. *Cf.* the *Antarvaṁśika* of the *Arthaśāstra*.

[5] *Aśoka*, 3rd ed , p. 94

[6] *The Social Organisation in North-East India* by Fick, translated by S. Maitra, pp 148-51.

[7] *IHQ*, 1933, 117: Barua takes the expressions *Jānapada* and *Raṭhika* of the Yerraguḍi copy of the Minor Rock Edict to mean 'people of the district' and 'citizens of the hereditary tribal states' respectively But *Raṭhika* of the record probably corresponds to *Rāshṭriya* of the Junāgaḍh inscription of Rudradāman so that the expressions *Jānapadas* and *Raṭhikas* mean 'people of the country parts,' and 'officials of the district ' Cf. *Raṭhika Mahāmātra of Bṛihat Saṁ.*, XV. 11.

[8] H. & F., Vol. III, p. 103.

and have the power of rewarding or punishing those who merit either." The measuring of the land connects those Magistrates with the *Rajjugāhaka Amachcha* of the *Jātakas*,[1] while the power of rewarding and punishing people connects them with the *Rājūkas* of Aśoka. It is probable, therefore, that the *Agronomoi* referred to by Strabo were identical with the *Rājūkas* and the *Rajjugāhaka Amachchas*. The *Arthaśāstra*[2] refers to a class of officials called "*Chora Rajjukas*," but there is no reference to the *Rajjukas* proper although on p. 60 "*Rajju*" is mentioned in conjunction with "*Chora Rajju*."

As regards the *Pradeśikas* or *Prādeśikas*, Senart, Kern and Bühler understood the term to denote local governors or local chiefs. Smith took it to mean District Officers. Hultzsch compares it with *Prādeśikeśvara* of Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[3] The word occurs only in the Third Rock Edict where the functionaries in question are included with the *Rājūkas* and the *Yutas* in the ordinance of the *Anusaṁyāna* or circuit. Thomas derives the word from *pradeśa* which means report[4] and identifies the *Prādeśikas* or *Pradeśikas* of the Edict with the *Pradeshṭṛis* of the *Arthaśāstra*.[5] The most important functions of the *Pradeshṭṛis* were *Bali-pragraha* (collection of taxes or suppression of recalcitrant chiefs), *Kaṇṭakaśodhana* (administration of criminal justice), *Chora-mārgaṇa*, (tracking of thieves) and *Adhyakshāṇām adhyaksha purushāṇām cha niyamanam* (checking superintendents and their men). They acted as intermediaries between the *Samāhartṛi* on the one hand and the *Gopas*,

[1] *Cf*. *Maitra*, Fick, pp. 148-49.

[2] P. 234.

[3] IV. 126.

[4] *JRAS*, 1915, p 97, *Arthaśāstra*, p. 111. In the Vishṇu Purāṇa, V, 26 3, *Pradeśa* has apparently the sense of counsel, instruction. S. Mitra suggests (*Indian Culture*, I, p. 310) that the *Prādesikas* were *Mahāmātras* of the Provincial governments, while the Rājūkas were *Mahāmātras* of the central government.

[5] *Cf*. The Irda grant where *Pradeshṭṛis* find mention along with *Sanghamukhyas* and others.

Sthānikas and *Adhyakshas* on the other.[1] It is, however, doubtful if the *Prādeśikas* can really be equated with Reporters. The more probable view is that they correspond to the subordinate governors, the *nomarchs, hyparchs* and *meridarchs* of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

As to the *Yutas* or *Yuktas,* they are described by Manu[2] as the custodians of *Praṇashṭādhigata dravya* (lost property which was recovered). In the *Arthaśāstra* too, they are mentioned in connection with *Samudaya* or state funds[3] which they are represented as misappropriating. Hultzsch suggests that they were 'secretaries' employed for codifying royal orders in the office of the *Mahāmātras.* The *Pulisā* or Agents are apparently identical with the *Purushas* or *Rāja Purushas* of the *Arthaśāstra.*[4] Hultzsch prefers to equate them with the *Gūḍha-purushas* and points out that they were graded into high ones, low ones, and those of middle rank.[5] They were placed in charge of many people[6] and controlled the *Rājūkas.* The *Paṭivedakā* or Reporters are doubtless the *Chāras* mentioned in Chapter 16 of the *Arthaśāstra,*[7] while the *Vachabhūmikas* or "Inspectors of cowpens" were evidently charged with the superintendence of "*Vraja*" referred to in Chapter 24.[8] The *Lipikaras* are the royal scribes one of whom, Chapaḍa, is mentioned by name in Minor Rock Edict II. *Dūtas* or envoys are referred to in Rock Edict XIII. If the *Kauṭilīya* is to be believed, they were divided into three classes, *viz.*, *Nisṛishṭārthāḥ* or Plenipotentiaries, *Parimitarthaḥ* or Charges d'Affaires and *Śāsanaharas* or con-

[1] Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, pp 142, 200, 217, 222, as stated above *Pradeshṭris* also occur in the Iida grant, *Ep. Ind.*, XXII, 150ff.

[2] VIII. 34.

[3] *Cf.* also *Mbh.*, ii. 5. 72. *Kachchichchāya vyāye yuktaḥ sarve gaṇaka lekhakāḥ.*

[4] Pp 59, 75.

[5] The three classes of *Purushas* are also known to the Great epic (*Mbh.*, ii. 5. 74).

[6] Pillar Edict VII.

[7] P. 38.

[8] Pp. 59-60.

veyers of royal writ.[1] The *Āyuktas* possibly find mention in the Kaliṅga Edicts. In the early Post-Mauryan and Scythian Age Āyuttas appear as village officials.[2] In the Gupta Age they figure as officers in charge of *Vishayas* or districts,[3] and also as functionaries employed in restoring the wealth of conquered kings. The full designation of the officers in question was *Āyukta-Purusha*.[4] They may have been included under the generic name of *Pulisā* referred to above. The *Kāranakas* who appear to be mentioned in the Yerraguḍi copy of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict, probably refer to judicial officers, teachers, or scribes.[5]

[1] With the *Śāsanaharas* may be compared the *Lekha-hārakas* of the *Harshacharita*, *Uchchhāsa*, II, p. 52.

[2] Luders' List, No. 1347.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, XV, No. 7, 138.

[4] Fleet, CII, pp. 8, 14.

[5] Cf. *Karanika*, Officer in-Charge of Documents or Accounts (*JHO*, 1935, 586). In inscriptions of the seventh century A.D. the word *Karana* stood for *Adhikaraṇa* (Departmental or District Secretariat), *Prabāsī*, 1350 B.S. *Śrāvaṇa*, 294. In Mhb., ii. 5, 34, *Kāraṇika* has, according to the commentary, the sense of a teacher. In the text itself the officers in question instruct the *Kumāras* and have to be *dharme sarvaśāstreshu kovidāḥ*, implying that their duties included among other things, those relating to *Dharma* (law, justice?).

CHAPTER V. THE MAURYA EMPIRE

THE ERA OF DHAMMAVIJAYA AND DECLINE

SECTION 1. AŚOKA AFTER THE KALIṄGA WAR

Chakkavattī ahuṁ rājā Jambusaṇḍassa issaro
muddhābhısitto khattiyo manussādhıpatī ahuṁ
adaṇḍena asatthena vijeyya paṭhavıṁ imaṁ
asāhasena dhammena samena manusāsiyā
dhammena rajjam kāretvā asmim paṭhavimaṇḍale
—*Aṅguttara Nikāya.*

We have already seen that the Kalinga war opened a new epoch in the history of Magadha and of India. During the first thirteen years of his reign Aśoka was a typical Magadhan sovereign—the inheritor of the policy of Bimbisāra, of Mahāpadma and of Chandragupta—conquering peoples, suppressing revolt, annexing territory. After the Kaliṅga war all this is changed. The older political philosophy which tradition associates with the names of Vassakāra and Kauṭilya gave way to a new statecraft inspired by the teaching of the sage of the Śākyas. Before proceeding to give an account of the remarkable change we should say a few words about the religious denominations of India and the condition of society during the reign of the great innovator.

In the days of Aśoka the people of India were divided into many sects of which the following were the most important:—

1. The orthodox *Deva*-worshippers.[1]
2. The *Ājīvikas* or the followers of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta.[2]

[1] Among the *Devas* worshipped in the Maurya period, Patañjali makes special mention of Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha

[2] This teacher was born in Saravana, probably near Sāvatthī or Śrāvastī. Jaina writers represent him as a person of low parentage and of contemptible

3. The *Nirgranthas* or *Jainas*, *i.e.*, the followers of Nigantha Nātaputta who is commonly called Mahāvīra of Vardhamāna.

4. The followers of Gautama Buddha Śākyamuni.

5. Other sects alluded to in Pillar Edict VII.

In Edict IV we have the following account of the prevailing state of society: "for a long period past, even for many hundred years, have increased the sacrificial slaughter of living creatures, the killing of animate beings, unseemly behaviour to relatives, unseemly behaviour to *Brāhmaṇas* and ascetics (*Śramaṇas*)."[1] Kings used to go out on so-called *Vihāra yātrās*[2] in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised.[3] The people performed various ceremonies (*maṁgala*)[4] on occasions of sickness, weddings of sons,[5] the weddings of daughters, the birth of children, and departure on journeys. The womankind performed many, manifold, trivial and worthless ceremonies.[6]

From the references in the Edicts to Brāhmaṇas, Kaivartas (of Kevaṭa *bhoga*) and Śramaṇas, *Bhikshu* and

character. The attitude of Buddhist authors is also not friendly. In reality he was one of the leading sophists of the sixth century B.C., and, for a time, was a close associate of Mahāvīra. According to the *Ājīvika* belief as expounded in the *Sāmañña phala Sutta* "the attainment of any given condition, of any character, does not depend on human effort (*purisa-kāre*). There is no such thing as power or energy, or human strength or human vigour (*purisaparakkamo*). All beings are bent this way and that by their fate (*nīyati*)." (*Dialogues*, Pt. I, p 71; Barua, *The Ājīvikas*, 1920, p. 9). An *Ājīvaparivrājaka* appears as a court astrologer of Bindusāra in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 370 ff.). A tax on "Ājīvakas" is referred to in an inscription of the twelfth century A D (Hultzsch., *SII*. I. 88) showing that the sect flourished in S India even in that late age. See also A. L. Basham, The *Ajivikas*.

[1] *Cf* Ajātaśatru's treatment of Bimbisāra, Viḍuḍabha's massacre of the Śākyas, Udayana's cruelty towards Puṇḍola, and Nanda's haughty demeanour towards Chāṇakya.

[2] Tours of pleasure, *cf*. Kauṭilya, p 332. *Mahābhārata*, XV. 1. 18:

Vihārayātrāsu punah Kururājo Yudhishṭhiraḥ
sarvān kāmān mahātejāh pradadāv-Ambikāsute.

[3] R. Edict VIII.

[4] For "*Maṁgala*" see also *Jātakas* No. 87, and No. 163 (*Hatthi-maṁgala*), and *Harsa-charita*, II (p. 27 of Parab's edition, 1918).

[5] For *Āvāha* and *Vivāha* see also *Mbh*., V. 141. 14; Kauṭilya, VII. 15.

[6] R. Edict IX.

Bhikshuṇī-Saṁghas it may be concluded that *Varṇa* (social gradation) and *Āśrama* (stages of socio-religious discipline) were established institutions. The position of the slaves and labouring poor in general (*dāsa, bhataka*) was, in some cases at any rate, not enviable. Women had to tolerate the *purdah* as well as polygamy. Ladies of the harem were under special guards (*stry-adhyaksha*). As will be seen in the following pages, the policy of Aśoka in regard to social matters was, in the main, one of mitigation and not, except in respect of certain kinds of *Samāja* and sundry obnoxious practices, of radical reform.

The Change of Aśoka's Religion

Aśoka had doubtless inherited the traditional devotion of Hindu kings to the gods (*devas*) and the Brāhmaṇas and, if the Kāśmīra chronicle of Kalhaṇa is to be believed, his favourite deity was Śiva. He had no scruples about the slaughter of men and animals: "formerly, in the kitchen of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King each day many hundred thousands of living creatures were slaughtered to make curries." The hecatombs of thousands of men and women sent to their doom during the Kaliṅga war have already been mentioned. The sight of the misery and bloodshed in that sanguinary campaign made a deep impression on him and awakened in his breast feelings of *anusochana*, "remorse, profound sorrow, and regret". About this time he came under the influence of Buddhist teaching. We read in Rock Edict XIII "after that, now that the Kaliṅgas had been annexed, began His Sacred Majesty's zealous practice of the Law of Piety (*dhramaśilana*), his love of that Law (*dhramakamata*), and his inculcation of that Law (*dhramanuśasti*)."[1]

[1] The view held by some well-known writers that the conversion of Aśoka took place *before* the Kaliṅga war rests on the evidence of the *Mahāvaṁsa* (Ch. V) and on certain assumptions, *viz.*, that Aśoka's *dhramakamata* became *tivra* (intense) immediately after the Kaliṅga war (there being no interval) and that Aśoka was indifferent during the period of *Upāsakatva* (when he was only a lay disciple) which, therefore, must have preceded the Kaliṅga war,

Although Aśoka became a Buddhist[1] he was not an enemy either of the *Devas* or of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Up to the last he took pride in calling himself *Devānaṁpiya*, beloved of the gods.[2] He found fault with unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas[3] and inculcated liberality to the same class. He was perfectly tolerant. "The king does reverence to men of all sects."[4] He reprobated *ātmapāsaṁḍa-pūjā*, honour to one's own sect, when coupled with *para-pāsaṁḍa-garahā*, disparagement of other sects. That he was sincere in his professions is proved

immediately after which his devotion became *tivra*. But the so-called indifference or want of activity is only relative. On the other hand, the supporters of the new theory have to explain why a recent convert to Buddhism should engage in a sanguinary conflict involving the death of countless *Śramaṇas*. Why again do the Minor Rock Edicts refer to contact with the *Saṁgha*, and not the Kaliṅga war, as the prelude and cause of more intense activity? It is to be noted that activity in the period of *Upāsakatva* is also described as *parākrama*, though it was surpassed by the greater energy of the period after contact with the Holy Order. Note also the explicit reference to *dhramakamata* as the result of the annexation of Kaliṅga *sometime after* (*tato pachhā adhunā*) the war. The use of the expressions *tato pachhā* and *adhunā* suggests that an interval supervened between the war and the intensity of Aśoka's *dhramaśilana* and *dhramakamata*. Moreover, we learn from the Minor Edicts and Pillar Edict VI that pious proclamations began to be issued a little more than 2½ years after Aśoka became an *Upāsaka* and 12 years after his coronation. This would place his conversion a little less than 9½ years after his *Abhisheka*, i.e., a little less than 1½ years after the Kaliṅga war.

[1] *Śākya* (Rūpnāth), *Buddha Śākya* (Maski), *Upāsaka* (Sahasrām); see Hultzsch, *CII*, p. xliv. *Cf* also *Kalhaṇa, Rājataraṅgiṇi*, i. 102ff. That Aśoka did become a Buddhist admits of no doubt. In the Bhābrū Edict he makes an open confession of his faith in the Buddha, the *Dharma* (Doctrine) and the *Saṁgha* (Order of Monks). He called the Buddha *Bhagavat*. He went on pilgrimage to the places of the Blessed One's nativity and enlightenment and worshipped at the former place. He declared that whatsoever had been spoken by the Buddha, all that was quite well spoken. He also believed in the cult of the "former" Buddhas. He took much interest in the exposition of the Buddhist Doctrine so that it might endure long. As to the *Saṁgha* he kept in close touch with it since his memorable visit to the Fraternity a year or so after his conversion. He impressed on the clergy the need of a correct exposition of the true doctrine and appointed special officers to busy themselves with the affairs of the Brotherhood. He also laid emphasis on *Vinaya-samutkarsha* and took steps to maintain the integrity of the Church and prevent schism within its fold.

[2] The title is reminiscent of the age of Hammurabi (*Camb. Anc. Hist.* I. p. 511).

[3] Edict IV.

[4] Edict XII.

by the Barābar Cave Dedications to the *Ājīvika* monks. His hostility was chiefly directed not towards the *Devas* and the Brāhmaṇas, not even towards *Varṇāśrama*, but the killing of men in war and *Samājas* (festive gatherings), ill-treatment of friends and acquaintances, comrades and relatives, slaves and servants, the slaughter of animals in sacrifice, and the performance of vulgar, useless and offensive ceremonies.

The Change of Foreign Policy

The effect of the change of religion was at once felt in foreign policy. The Emperor declared that "of all the people who were slain, done to death, or carried away captive in Kaliṅga, if the hundredth part or the thousandth part were now to suffer the same fate, it would be a matter of regret to His Sacred Majesty. Moreover, should any one do him wrong, that too must be borne with by His Sacred Majesty, so far as it can possibly be borne with." In Kaliṅga Edict I, the Emperor expressed his desire that the unsubdued peoples in the frontiers of the imperial dominions (*Aṁtā avijitā*) "should not be afraid of him, that they should trust him, and should receive from him happiness not sorrow." The chiefest conquest in the Emperor's opinion was the conquest by righteousness (*Dhamma-vijaya*). In Edict IV he exultingly says, "the reverberation of the kettle-drums (*Bherighoso*) has become the reverberation of the Law of Piety (*Dhammaghoso*)." Not content with what he himself did he called upon his sons and even his great grandsons to eschew new conquests—*putra papotra me asu navaṁ vijayam ma vijetaviyaṁ*. Here we have a complete renunciation of the old policy of military conquest or *Digvijaya* and the enunciation of a new policy, *viz.*, that of *Dhammavijaya*.[1] The full political effects of this change of policy became manifest only after the

[1] The Aśokan conception of *Dhammavijaya* was similar to that described in the *Chakkavatti Sihanāda Sutta*, "conquest not by the scourge, not by the

death of Aśoka, *perhaps even after the 27th year of his consecration.* From the time of Bimbisāra to the Kaliṅga war the history of India was the story of the expansion of Magadha from a tiny state in South Bihār to a gigantic Empire extending from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. After the Kaliṅga war ensued a period of stagnation at the end of which the process is reversed. The empire gradually dwindled down in extent till it sank to the position from which Bimbisāra and his successors had raised it.

True to his principle Aśoka made no attempt to annex the frontier (*Prachaṁta, aṁta, sāmanta, sāmīpa*). kingdoms, *viz.*, Chola, Pāṇḍya, Satiyaputra, Keralaputra, Taṁbapaṁni (Ceylon) and the realm of *Aṁtiyako Yonarāja*, who is usually identified with Antiochos II Theos, King of Syria and Western Asia. On the contrary, he maintained friendly relations with them.

The **Chola** country was drained by the river Kāverī and comprised the districts of Trichinopoly and Tanjore. We learn from a South Indian inscription[1] that Hara, *i.e.*, the god Śiva, asked Guṇabhara (Mahendravarman I, Pallava), "How could I, standing in a temple on earth, view the great power of the Cholas or the river Kāverī?" When Pulakeśin II Chalukya strove to conquer the Cholas "the Kāverī had her current obstructed by the causeway formed by his elephants." The Chola capital was Uraiyūr

sword, but by righteousness" (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part III, p. 59). It was different from the Hindu conception explained and illustrated by the *Mahābhārata* (XII. 59, 38-39), the *Harivaṁśa* (I. 14 21), the *Kauṭilīya* (p. 382), and the *Raghuvaṁśa* (IV. 43). Attention may be invited in this connection to a **Statement of Arrian** that "a sense of justice prevented any Indian king from attempting conquest beyond the limits of India" (*Camb. Hist. Ind.* I. 321); M'crindle, *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, 209. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the discourse entitled the *Chakkavatti Sihanāda* (*Lion Roar* of the *Chakravarti* or emperor who 'conquers by righteousness') possibly affords a clue to a proper appreciation of the famous Sarnath Capital with its *Chakra* and crowning lions. *Cf* also *Rāmāyana* II. 10.36 *Yāvadāvartate chakram tāvatī me vasundharā*, IC, XV, 1.4, p. 179f. For the *Aśoka chakra*, see IC XV (1948-49), pp. 179ff,

1 Hultzsch, SII, Vol. I, p. 34.

(*Sanskrit* Uragapura) or Old Trichinopoly.[1] The principal port was at Kāviripaṭṭinam or Pugār on the northern bank of the Kāverī.[2]

The **Pāndya** country corresponded to the Madurā, and Tinnevally districts with perhaps the southern portions of Rāmnad and the Travancore Cochin State. It had its capitals at Kolkai and Madurā (*Dakshiṇa* Mathurā). The rivers Tāmraparṇī and Kṛitamālā or Vaigai flowed through it. Kātyāyana derives Pāṇḍya from Pāṇḍu. The Pāṇḍus are mentioned as the ruling race of Indraprastha in the *Mahābhārata* as well as in several *Jātakas*,[3] Ptolemy (*cir.* 150 A.D.) speaks of the country of the Pandoouoi in the Pañjāb. There can be no doubt that Pāṇḍu was the name of a real tribe or clan in northern India. Kātyāyana's statement regarding the connection of the Pāṇḍyas with the Pāṇḍus receives some support from the fact that the name of the Pāṇḍya capital (Madurā) was identical with the famous city of Mathurā in the Śūrasena country which, according to Epic tradition, was the seat of a family intimately associated by ties of friendship and marriage with the Pāṇḍus of Indraprastha. The connection between the Pāṇḍus, the Śūrasenas and the Pāṇḍyas seems to be alluded to in the confused stories narrated by Megasthenes regarding Herakles and Pandaia.[4]

Satiyaputra is identified by Mr. Venkatesvaraiyar[5] with *Satya-vrata-kshetra* or Kañchîpura. But Dr.

[1] Aelian, however, has the following reference to the realm of Soras (Chola?) and its chief city 'There is a city which a man of royal extraction called Soras governed at the time when Eukratides governed the Bactrians, and the name of that city is Perimuda (city of Perumal?). It is inhabited by a race of fish-eaters who go off with nets and catch oysters." For Uragapura in Cholika Vishaya, see *Ep. Ind.*, X. 103.

[2] For the early history of the Chola Kingdom and other Tamil states see *CHI*, Vol. I, Ch. 24; Smith. *FHI*, Ch. XVI; Kanakasabhai Pillay, *Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, Krishnaswami Aiyangar, *Beginnings of South Indian History* and *Ancient India*; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, *The Colas*, etc.

[3] I find it difficult to agree with Dr. Barua, *Inscriptions of Aśoka*, Part II (1943), p. 232, that the "line of Yudhishthira" .that ruled at Indraprastha in the Kuru country "has nothing to do with Pāṇḍu's eldest son".

[4] *Ind. Ant.*, 1877, p. 249.

[5] *JRAS*, 1918 pp. 541-42.

Aiyangar points out that the term *Satya-vrata-kshetra* is applied to the town of Kāñchī or a part of it, not to the country dependent upon it. There is besides the point whether *vrata* could become *puta*. Dr. Aiyangar supports Bhandarkar's identification with Satpute. He takes Satiyaputra to be a collective name of the various matriarchal communities like the Tulus and the Nāyars of Malabar.[1] According to Dr. Smith[2] Satiyaputra is represented by the Satyamaṅgalam Tāluk of Coimbatore. Mr. T. N. Subramaniam[3] prefers Koṅgunāḍu ruled by the *Kośar* people famous for their truthfulness. Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar[4] takes Satiyaputra to be the equivalent of Atiyamān, chief of Kutiraimalai with his headquarters at Takaḍūr, now in Mysore. Mr. P. J. Thoma, however, gives reasons for identifying it with "Satyabhūmi" of the *Kēralolpatti,* a territory which corresponds roughly to "North Malabar including a portion of Kasergode Tāluk, South Canara."[5]

Keralaputra (Ketalaputo or Chera) is "the country south of Kūpaka (or Satya), extending down to Kanneti in Central Travancore (Karunagapalli Tāluk). South of it lay the political division of Mūshika."[6] It was watered by the river Periyar, perhaps identical with the Churṇī of the *Arthaśāstra*[7] on the banks of which stood its capital Vañji (near Cochin) and at its mouth the seaport of Muziris (Kranganur).

[1] *JRAS*, 1919, pp. 581-84.

[2] *Aśoka*, Third Ed., p. 161.

[3] *JRAS*, 1922, 86.

[4] *Cera kings of the Sangam period*, 17-18, cf., *now* N. Sastri, *ANM*, 25

[5] *JRAS*, 1923, p. 412. B. A. Saletore is, however, inclined to disparage the authority of the *Keralolpatti* (*Indian Culture*, I, 668). But Kirfel points out (*Die Cosmographie Der Inder*, 1920, p. 78) that Satīya (variants Satīatha, Sanīpa) finds mention in the list of southern *Janapadas*, along with the Mūshakas, in the *Jambukhaṇḍa* section of the *Mahābhārata* (Bk. VI). For other views see *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. II 549ff.; *Aiyangar, Com.* Vol., 45-47 Mr M. G Pai suggests that '*Satiya*' corresponds to *Sāntika* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, 58.37, and the *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*, xiv. 27, and included South Kanara. *Cf* Setae of Pliny. (Bomb. Gaz. Gujrat, 533).

[6] *JRAS*, 1923, p. 413

[7] P. 75. Cf. *Śuka saṁdesa* (Aiyar, *Cera kings*, 94).

Ceylon was known in ancient times as Pārasamudra[1] as well as Tāmraparṇī (Greek Taprobane).[2] Taṁbapaṁni, *i.e.*, Tāmraparṇī is mentioned in Rock Edicts II and XIII of Aśoka. Dr. Smith lately[3] took the word to mean not Ceylon but the river Tāmraparṇī in Tinnevally. He referred to the Girnar text *"ā Taṁbapaṁni"* which according to him indicated that the river was meant, not the island. Now, in Edict II the phrase *"ā Taṁbapaṁni"* comes after Ketalaputo and not after Pāḍā. The expression "Ketalaputo as far as the (river) Tāmraparṇī" is hardly appropriate because the Tāmraparṇī is a Pāṇḍyan river.[4] We, therefore, prefer to take Tāmraparṇī to mean Ceylon. Aśoka's Ceylonese contemporary was Devānaṁpiya Tissa whose accession may be dated about 250 or 247 B.C.

Aśoka maintained friendly relations not only with the Tamil powers of the south, but also with his **Hellenistic frontager,** Antiochos II Theos, king of Syria and Western Asia (B.C. 261-246); and even with the kings the neighbours of Antiochos, namely, Ptolemy II, Philadelphos,

[1] Greek Palaesimundu, see Ray Chaudhuri, *Ind. Ant.*, 1919, pp. 195-96, *commentary* on the *Kauṭilīya*, Ch. XI; *Rāmāyaṇa*, VI, 3, 21 (Laṅkā described as *sthitā "pāre samudrasya"*).

On reading Law's *Ancient Hindu Polity* (p 87 n) I find that the identification was also suggested by Mr. N. L. Dey. The equation Pārasamudra = Palaesimundu is not less plausible than the equations Sātavāhana = Śālivahana, Katāha = Kaḍāram = Kiḍāram = Kantoli (pace Dr. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, 56 79, 168).

[2] For other names of Ceylon see *"Megasthenes and Arrian"* published by Chuckerverty and Chatterjee, 1926, p. 60 n. For a short history of the island see *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, Chap. XXV, and *IHQ*, II. 1. p. 1ff. According to tradition recorded in the *Dīpavaṁsa* and the *Mahāvaṁsa* the first Aryan immigrants were led by Prince Vijaya of Lāla, whom the chronicles represent as a grandson of a Princess of Vaṅga. The identification of Lāla is, however, open to controversy, some placing it in Gujarāt, others identifying it with Rāḍha or Western Bengal. Barnett may be right in his assumption that the tradition of two different streams of immigration was knit together in the story of Vijaya. See also *IHQ*, 1933, 742ff.

[3] *Aśoka*, 3rd Ed., p. 162.

[4] Even those who prefer to see in the passage a reference to a kingdom in the Valley of the Tāmraparṇī river, have to prove that such a kingdom did exist in the Maurya age apart from "Pāḍā" and Taprobane, and to explain the particular way in which it is mentioned in Edict II.

king of Egypt (B.C. 285-247); Magas, king of Cyrene in North Africa (who probably died not later than B.C. 258)[1]; Antigonos Gonatas, king of Macedonia (B.C. 277 or 276-239); and Alexander who ruled over Epirus (B.C. 272-*c.* 255) according to Norris, Westergaard, Lassen, Senart, Smith and Marshall.[2] Beloch and Hultzsch, however, suggest[3] that Alikasudara of Edict XIII is the comparatively insignificant ruler, Alexander of Corinth, the son of Craterus (B.C. 252—*cir.* 244) and not Alexander of Epirus (272—*cir.* 255), the son of Pyrrhus.

Though Aśoka did not covet the territories of his neighbours, there is evidence that he gave them advice on occasions, and established philanthropic institutions in their dominions. In other words, he regarded them as objects of spiritual conquest (*Dhamma-vijaya*).

"My neighbours, too, should learn this lesson."[4]

"Among his frontagers the Cholas, the Pāṇḍyas, the Satyaputra, the Ketalaputra as far as Tāmraparṇī, Antiochos, the Greek king, and even the kings the neighbours of that Antiochos, everywhere have been made healing arrangements of His Sacred and Gracious Majesty the King."

In Edict XIII Aśoka declares that the "conquest of the Law of Piety, ... has been won by His Sacred Majesty ...... among all his neighbours as far as six hundred leagues, where the king of the Greeks named Antiochos dwells, and beyond (the realm) of that Antiochos (where dwell) the four kings (*rājāno*) severally Ptolemy (Turamāyo), Antigonos (Aṁtekina), Magas (Maga or Maka), and Alexander (Alikasudaro)—(likewise) in the south (*nicha*), the Cholas and the Paṇḍyas as far as Taṁbapaṁni ..... Even where the envoys (*dūtā*) of His Sacred Majesty do not penetrate,[5] those people, too,

[1] Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, p. 449 f.

[2] *Monuments of Sānchī*, I, 28 n.

[3] *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 943ff. *Ins. of Aśoka*, xxxi.

[4] M. R. Edict I.

[5] Have we here a reference to countries like Suvaṇṇabhumi named in the list of territories to which missionaries were sent according to the *Mahāvaṁsa*?

hearing His Sacred Majesty's ordinance based upon the Law of Piety and his instruction in the Law, practise and will practise the Law."[1] Buddhism doubtless made some progress in Western Asia and influenced later sects like the Manichaeans. But Greeks apparently were not much impressed by lessons on non-violence. When the strong arm of Aśoka, "who possessed the power to punish in spite of his repentance," was withdrawn, the Yavanas poured once more into the Kābul valley, the Pañjab and the *Madhya-deśa* and threw all the province into confusion. The southern missions were more successful. Curiously enough, the Ceylonese chronicles do not seem to refer to the envoys sent to the *independent* Tamil and Hellenistic kingdoms[2] but name the missionaries sent to Ceylon and **Suvaṇṇabhūmi** (Lower Burma and Sumatra). The Ceylonese mission was headed by prince Mahendra who secured the conversion of Devānaṁpiya Tissa and many of his people. No direct reference to Suvaṇṇabhūmi occurs in the Edicts hitherto discovered.

The Change in Internal Policy

The effects of Aśoka's change of religion after Kaliṅga war were felt not only in foreign policy but also in internal affairs. The principal objects of his complaint according to Rock Edict IV and the Kaliṅga Edicts were:

1. The sacrificial slaughter (*āraṁbho*) of living creatures.

[1] From Buddhism in Western Asia, see Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, II. 378; and Alberūnī, p 21; *JRAS*, 1913, 76; M'Crindle, *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature*, p. 185; Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. III. p. 3. 350 f; cf Smith, *EHI*, 4th ed, 197; Burlingame, trans., *Dhammapada Commentary*, Introduction.

[2] Mention is however made of the *Yona* country along with Kasmīra, Gandhāra and Himālaya (Geiger, 82). This Yona territory is perhaps to be identified with the homonymous land in the Kābul valley associated with Kamboja and Gandhāra in the Aśokan Inscriptions. But reference in a vague way to the Levantine world is not completely ruled out. The Deccan lands mentioned in connection with the traditional missionary activity of the Aśokan age include Mahishamaṇḍala, Vanavāsa (in the Kanarese area), Aparāntaka (on the west coast), and Mahāraṭṭha (Mahārāshṭra) in the upper valley of the Godāvarī.

2. Violence (*vihiṁsā*) to animate beings.
3. Unseemly behaviour to (*asaṃpratipati*) to kinsmen (*jñāti*).
4. Unseemly behaviour to *Brāhmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas*.
5. Maladministration in the Provinces.

According to Rock Edict I, Aśoka saw much offence not only in the sacrificial slaughter of animals, but also in certain *Samājas* or festive gatherings which, as we learn from the *Kauṭilīya*,[1] were often witnessed by kings and emperors.[2] The *Samāja*, says Smith, was of two kinds. The popular festival kind accompanied by animal fights, heavy drinking and feasting, including much consumption of meat, was necessarily condemned by Aśoka, as being inconsistent with his principles. The other kind, the semi-religious theatrical performance, sometimes given in the temples of Sarasvatī, the goddess of learning, was apparently not included among offensive *Samājas*. Dr. Thomas[3] describes the disapproved Samāja as "a celebration of games or contests taking place in an arena or amphitheatre surrounded by platforms (*mañcha*) for spectators (*prekshā*)." This kind of (*Samāja*) is apparently referred to in the following lines of the *Virāṭa* parva of the *Mahābhārata*: —

Ye cha kechinniyotsyanti Samājeshu niyodhakāḥ.[4]

"Those combatants who will take part in wrestling in the *Samājas*."

Tatra Mallāḥ samāpetur digbhyo rājan sahasrasaḥ
Samāje Brahmaṇo rājan tathā Paśupater api
Mahākāyāḥ Mahāvīryāḥ Kālakanjā ivāsurāḥ.[5]

"O king, there arrived, by thousands, boxers from all quarters, in that festive gathering in honour of Brahman as well as Paśupati (Śiva). They possessed gigantic bodies and immense strength like the Titans styled Kālakañja."

[1] P. 45.
[2] For the holding of *Samājas* in Magadha and in neighbouring countries see *Vinaya*, IV. 267; *Mahāvastu*, III. 57 and 383.
[3] *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 392ff.
[4] *Virāṭa*, 2, 7.
[5] *Virāṭa*, 13, 15-16.

The harmless *Samāja* is well illustrated by the gathering in the temple of the goddess of learning referred to in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (*Pakshasya māsasya vā prajñāte' hani Sarasvatyā bhavane niyuktānāṁ nityaṁ Samājaḥ*). According to Hultzsch the harmless *Samāja* refers to edifying shows.[1]

Aśoka determined to put a stop to the practices, referred to above, which he did not approve. At the same time he sought to improve the moral and material condition of the people to such an extent as to effect the "association of gods with men."[2] He did all this "in order that he might discharge the debt (which he owed) to living beings (that) he might make them happy in this (world) and (that) they might attain heaven in the other (world)." The means employed to achieve this object may be classed under four heads:

1. Administrative reforms.
2. Dissemination of instructions in the *Dhamma* (Law of Piety or Duty).
3. Benevolent activity; promotion of the welfare of man and beast.
4. Religious toleration and prevention of schism in the Buddhist church.

Administrative Reforms

In the first place, Aśoka instituted the Quinquennial and Triennial *Anusaṁyāna* or Circuit of the *Yutas*, *Rājūkas* *Prādeśikas*, and *Mahāmātras*. Jayaswal and Smith[3] were

[1] See also *IHQ*, 1928, March, 112ff.

[2] *Cf.* Minor Rock Edirt I. *Cf.* The description in the *Harivaṁśa* of a prosperous realm where (*rājye mahodaye*) gods and men dwelt together (*Bhavishyaparva*, Ch. 32.1) "*Devatānāṁ manushyānāṁ sahavāso' bhavattadā.*" Hultzsch, however, compares (xlv) *Deva* with *Divyāni rūpāṇi* of Rock Edict IV.

[3] *Aśoka*, 3rd edition, p. 164; Mr. A. K. Bose (*IHQ*, 1933, 811) takes *anusaṁyāna* in the sense of 'a court-house or a citadel.' But the epic reference to *puṇyatīrthānusaṁyānam* (Mbh. i. 2, 123), 'going forth to holy places of pilgrimage,' suggests that the interpretation proposed by Kern and Bühler is the one least open to objection. See also Barua, *Aśoka Edicts in New Light*, 83ff.

of opinion that the whole administrative staff from the Rājūkas and the Prādeśikas down to the *Yutas* could not possibly have gone on circuit at once every five years. They interpreted the term as signifying a regular system of transfers from one station to another. But there is nothing in the text to show that *all* the officers were required to go on circuit *at once*. The *anusaṁyāna* of the *Yutas*, *Rājūkas* and *Prādeśikas* was quinquennial and was mainly intended for propaganda work. The *anusaṁyāna* of the *Mahāmātras* was specially instituted for the purpose of checking miscarriage of justice, arbitrary imprisonment and torture in the outlying provinces (Kaliṅga, and the Ujjayinī and Takshaśilā regions).

Secondly, Aśoka created a number of new posts, *e.g.*, *Dharma-mahāmātras* and possibly *Dharma-Yutas*.[1] The *Dharma-mahāmātras* were given a protective mission among people of all sects including the Brāhmaṇas and the *Nirgranthas* or Jainas, and among the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Risṭikas and all the Aparāntas. "Among servants and masters, Brāhmaṇas and the wealthy (*Ibhyas*),[2] among the helpless and the aged, they are employed in freeing from worldly cares their subordinates (in the department) of the Law of Piety. They are also employed on the revision (of sentences of) imprisonment or execution, in the reduction of penalties, or (the grant of) release, on the grounds of motive, having children, instigation, or advanced years... At Pāṭaliputra and in all provincial (*bāhira*) towns, in the family establishments of the king's brothers and sisters, as well as of other relatives, they are everywhere employed." The *Dharma-mahāmātras* were further engaged every where in the imperial dominions (*vijita*) or indeed in the whole world (*Pṛithivī*) as known to the Mauryas, among the *Dharma-Yutas* with

[1] *Dhammayuta* may not be an official designation. It may mean simply 'one devoted to Dhamma' (morality, righteousness). *Cf.* Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, 2nd ed., pp. 311, 343.

[2] We have here a reference probably to the fourfold division of society into Brāhmaṇas, Kshatriyas or nobles (*Ibhyas*), Vaiśyas (*Aryas*), and Śūdras (*Bhaṭa*).

regard to "the concerns of the Law, the establishment of the Law, and the business of almsgiving." The border countries (*deśa*) were placed under the special care of the *Āvutikas*.[1]

The emperor was naturally anxious to keep himself fully informed without delay about all public affairs, specially about the doings of the *Mahāmātras* on whom the success of his mission mainly depended. He, therefore, gave *special directions to the Paṭivedakas* or Reporters that when a matter of urgency committed to the *Mahāmātras* and discussed in the *Parishad* or Council occasioned a division of opinion or *nijhatī* (adjournment?)[2] he must be informed without delay.

It is apparent from the Kaliṅga Edicts and Rock Edict VI that Aśoka kept a watchful eye on the *Mahāmātras* especially on those who administered justice in cities. But he was more indulgent towards the *Rājūkas* for whose intelligence he apparently entertained great respect. To the *Rājūkas* "set over many hundred thousands of people" the emperor *granted independence* in the award of honours and penalties in order that those officials might perform their duties confidently and fearlessly. He wanted, however, to maintain some uniformity in penalties as well as in procedure. For this reason he issued the following rule: —

"To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted."

Lastly, Aśoka issued certain regulations restricting slaughter and mutilation of animals, and up to the twenty-seventh year of his coronation effected twenty-five jail deliveries. This suggests, as has been pointed out by Hultzsch, that the emperor used to proclaim an amnesty to criminals at almost every anniversary of his coronation.

[1] *Cf.* Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, 100 n 7.

[2] For procedure in cases of disputations in an Assembly see also *Jaim Up. Br* III 7.6 Can *Nijhatī* imply reference to the *Upadrashṭṛis* hinted at in the *Brāhmaṇa* passage? The help of *Upadrashṭṛis* was invoked by the Kuru-Pañchālas to arrive at a satisfactory agreement or understanding in case of dispute. (*Cf* also Barua, *Aśoka Edicts in New Light*, p. 78).

Measures adopted to disseminate Instructions in the Law of Piety

Though himself convinced of the truth of the Buddha's teaching of the efficacy of worship at Buddhist holy places, of the necessity of making a confession of faith in the Buddhist Trinity, of keeping in close touch with the Buddhist Order of monks and maintaining its discipline and solidarity, Aśoka probably never sought to impose his purely sectarian belief on others. He attempted, however, to put an end to practices and institutions that he considered to be opposed to the fundamental principles of morality which, according to him, constituted the essence of all religions. The prospect that he held before the people at large is not that of *sambodhi* (or of *nirvāṇa*) but of *svarga* (heaven) and of mingling with the *devas*. *Svarga* could be attained and the gods could be approached by all people, high or low, if only they showed *parākrama*, zeal, not in adherence to a sectarian dogma or the performance of barren ritual (*maṁgala*) but in following the ancient rule (*porāṇā pakitī*), the common heritage of Indians of all denominations, *viz.*, "obedience must be rendered to parents and elders; firmness (of compassion) must be shown towards living creatures; truth must be spoken; these same moral virtues must be practised. In the same way the teacher must be reverenced by the pupil, and fitting courtesy should be shown to the relatives." In Edict XIII we have the following: "hearkening to superiors, hearkening to father and mother, hearkening to teachers (or elders), and proper treatment of friends, acquaintances, comrades, relatives, slaves[1] and servants, with steadfastness of devotion." Edict VII lays stress on "mastery over the senses, purity of mind, gratitude, and steady devotion". In the Second Pillar Edict it is declared that the Law of

[1] For the question of slavery in Maurya India, see Monahan, *Early History of Bengal*, pp. 164-65. It is to be noted that Aśoka did not abolish slavery, just as he did not do away with caste or *purdah*. He simply wanted to mitigate the rigours of the existing social polity.

Piety consisted in *Apāsinave, bahukayāne, dayā, dāne, sache sochaye,* "little impiety, many good deeds, compassion, liberality, truthfulness, purity".

In the Pillar Edicts again prominence is given to self-examination and spiritual insight. Towards the end of his career Aśoka seems to have been convinced that reflection and meditation were of greater efficacy than moral regulations. But the need for such regulations was keenly felt by him in the early years of his reign.

We learn from Minor Rock Edict I that for more than two-and-a-half years Aśoka was a lay disciple (*Upāsaka*). During the first year he did not exert himself strenuously. Later on he seems to have *entered*[1] the *Saṅgha* and begun to exert himself strenuously.[2] He issued the famous pro-

[1] "*Approached*," according to Hultzsch, in whose opinion the two-and-a-half years of *Upāsakatva* include the period which followed his "Visit" (not "entry") to the *Sangha*. The view that Aśoka actually joined the Holy Order is, however, supported by I-tsing who mentions an image of Aśoka dressed in the garb of a Buddhist monk (Takakusu, *I-tsing*, 73). That rulers and statesmen could be monks as well, even in early times, appears probable from Lüders Ins. No. 1144 which refers to a *Śramaṇa mahāmātra* of Nāsik in the days of the early Sātavāhana king Krishṇa, *Cf.* Milinda, IV. 6. 49 (ref. to a Śramaṇa King), Geiger, trans., *Mahāvaṁsa*, 240 (Kutakaṇna Tissa)

[2] Rock Edict IV has been interpreted by scholars to mean that Aśoka sought to promote the observance of the Buddhist doctrine by exhibiting spectacles of aerial chariots (*Vimānadasanā*), of elephants (*Hastidasanā*), masses of fire (*Agikhaṁdhāni*) and other representations of a *divya, i.e.,* divine (not terrestrial) nature. Dr Bhandarkar (*Ind. Ant.*, 1912, p. 26), refers to the Pāli *Vimānavatthu* which describes the splendour of the various celestial abodes (*Vimānas*) in order to induce listeners and spectators to live good and unblemished lives, and thereby attain to these. Aśoka is said to have made representations of these *Vimānas* and paraded them in various places *Hasti*, according to Dr. Bhandarkar, is *Śveto hasti, i.e.*, Buddha himself who is also described as "*Gajatama,*" *i.e.*, *Gajottama,* the most excellent elephant. As regards *Agikhaṁdha* (*Agniskandha*) Dr. Bhandarkar draws our attention to *Jātaka* No. 40 which refers to a blazing fire-pit created by Māra on the surface of which the *Bodhisattva* strode and gave a bowl to a hungry *Pachcheka Buddha* and extolled alms-giving. Hultzsch suggests that *Hasti* may refer to the vehicles of the four "*Mahārājas*" (*lokapālas* or guardians of quarters). He takes *Agikaṁdha* to refer to 'radiant beings of another world' while Jarl Charpentier (*IHQ*, 1933, 87) understands it to mean piles of (hell-) fire. The interpretation of Hultzsch accords better with the testimony of the commentary on the *Rāmāyaṇa* (II. 68. 16) which explains *divyaṁ* as *viśishṭa devatādhishthitam*. The celestial elephant figures prominently in the Tārāvaloka story of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* (Penzer, VIII. 131), and Mountain of fire, *ibid.* 50, 51; III. 6, 17; Cf. also *aggi-khando* in *Jataka*, VI 330, Coomaraswamy in

clamation, "Let small and great exert themselves," and caused to be engraved the imperishable record of his purpose on the rocks and upon stone pillars wherever there were stone pillars in his dominions.

Aśoka at first utilised the existing administrative machinery for religious propaganda.[1] He commanded his Council (*Parishad*) to inculcate the *Dharma* on the subordinate officials styled *Yutas* and ordered the latter as well as the higher officials styled *Rājūkas*, and *Prādeśikas* to inculcate the same while they set out for tour (*anusaṁyāna*). The *Dharma* which they were to preach was explained thus: "An excellent thing is the hearkening to father and mother[2]; an excellent thing is liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brāhmaṇas and ascetics; excellent is abstention from the slaughter of living creatures; excellent is small expense with small accumulation."

When he had been consecrated thirteen years, Aśoka created the new officials called *Dharma-mahāmātras* who

B. C Law, vol. I. 469; Note the *Sutta* referred to in Geiger, *Mahāvaṁsa*, trans. pp. 85, 110.

The passage containing the words *Vimānadasanā*, *Hastidasanā*, etc., has been explained differently in *A Volume of Indian Studies presented to Professor E. J. Rapson*, pp. 546 f. According to the interpretation that finds favour with some writers, the spectacles in question were exhibited not by Aśoka but by previous rulers to the accompaniment of the sound of drums. But thanks to Aśoka "the sound of the *bheri* had become the sound of *dharma*," that is to say instruction in *dharma* took the place of martial music that used to be heard on the occasion of pompous shows of edifying subjects in bygone times. What former kings could not accomplish by gaudy spectacles, was achieved by Aśoka by the simple unostentatious teaching of the true Doctrine. The *bheri* was now used to announce the king's rescripts on morality, *cf.* the Yerragudi copy of the Minor Rock Edict—*Rājuke ānapitaviye bherinā jānapadam ānāpayisati. raṭhikānaṁ cha* (*Ind. Culture*, I, p. 310; *IHQ*, 1933, 117).

[1] According to one view Aśoka sent special missionaries styled *Vyuṭha* to expound his teaching. The interpretation of *Vyuṭha* as missionary was suggested by Senart and accepted by Smith (*Aśoka*, Third Ed., p. 158). Dr. Bhandarkar takes *Vyuṭha* or *Vivutha* to mean "officials on tour." Hultzsch thinks that *Vyutha* refers to Aśoka himself while he was on tour (p. 169, note 8). The word has also the sense of dawn, day-break, day, in other words, it has a chronological significance. Other interpretations are also suggested by scholars. The least plausible is the one offered by Dr. Barua (*D. R. Bhandarkar* volume, 369) who finds in the expression reference to the copies of the particular proclamation sent forth from the capital.

[2] Cf. *Sigālovāda Suttanta* (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, III, 173ff).

were specially entrusted with the work of "*dhaṁmādhithāna*" and "*dhaṁmavadhi*", *i.e.*, the establishment and increase of Piety.

While his officers were busy preaching the new Gospel, the emperor himself did not remain idle. Already in his eleventh regnal year he had "started on the path" leading to *Saṁbodhi* (*ayāya Saṁbodhim*)[1] and commenced the tours of Piety (*Dhaṁma-yātā*) in the place of the old tours of pleasure (*Vihāra-yātā*) In the tours of Piety this was the practice—visiting ascetics and Brāhmaṇas, with liberality to them; visiting elders, with largess of gold; visiting the people of the country or perhaps rural areas (*Janapada*) with instruction in the Law of Piety, and discussion of that law. The memory of a pious tour in Aśoka's twenty-first regnal year[2] (B.C. 249 according to Smith) is preserved by the Rummindeī and Nigāli Sāgar epigraphs in the Nepalese Tarai. These records prove that Aśoka visited the birthplace of Gautama and paid reverence to the *stupa* of Konākamana, one of the former Buddhas.[3]

In 242 B.C., according to Dr. Smith, Aśoka issued the Seven Pillar Edicts which contain, among other things, a review of the measures taken during his reign for the "promotion of religion, the teaching of moral duty".

Benevolent Activity, Promotion of the Welfare of Man and Beast

Aśoka abolished the sacrificial slaughter of animals, offensive Samājas and the massacre of living creatures to make curries in the imperial kitchen. Rock Edict VIII refers to the abolition of the *vihāra-yātrās* or tours of

[1] Some scholars take *Saṁbodhi* to mean 'supreme knowledge' But Dr. D. R Bhandarkar contents that *Saṁbodhi* is equivalent to the Bodhi Tree or the Mahābodhi Temple at Bodh Gayā. According to the *Divyāvadāna* (p. 393) Aśoka visited Bodhi in the company of the *Sthavira* or Elder Upagupta (Hultzsch, CII, xliii).

[2] Were these tours decennial?

[3] He had enlarged the stupa of Konākamana six years earlier, but the personal presence on that occasion is by no means clear,

pleasure in which hunting and other similar amusements used to be practised. Pillar Edict V contains a code of regulations[1] restricting the slaughter and mutilation of animals. Dr. Smith points out that the prohibitions against animal slaughter in this edict coincide to a considerable extent with those recorded in the *Arthaśāstra*.

The emperor established healing arrangements in two kinds, namely, healing arrangements for men and healing arrangements for beasts. Medicinal herbs also both for men and for beasts, wheresoever lacking, were imported and planted Roots also and fruits,[2] wheresoever lacking, were imported and planted. On the roads wells were dug probably at intervals of 8 *kos*, flights of steps built for descending into the water, and banyan trees and mango groves planted for the enjoyment of man and beast.

Pillar Edict VII refers to the employment of superior officers (*Mukhyas*) in the distribution of alms, both the emperor's own and those of the queens and princes. One of the Minor Pillar Edicts refers to the donations of the second Queen Kāruvākī,[3] mother of Tīvara: "whatever gift has been given here by the second Queen—be it a mango-garden, or pleasure-grove (*ārāma*) or alms-house (*dānagṛiha*) or aught else—is reckoned as proceeding from that queen."

Mention may also be made of remission of taxes by the emperor himself, *e.g.*, in Lumminigāma, and money-grants (*hirannapaṭividhāna*) to old men. The people of *janapadas* (districts), doubtless including the *grāmas*[4] (villages), were also sought to be benefited by the grant of autonomy and the establishment of uniformity of punish-

[1] *Dhamma-niyama, cf.* Patañjali I, I, I.

[2] Cf. reference to figs. in Bindusāra's correspondence with Antiochos.

[3] Dr Barua suggests the identification of this lady with Asandhimittā of the *Mahāvaṁsa* and the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (*Indian Culture*, I, 123). The suggestion, though ingenious, is hardly convincing.

[4] References to *grāmas* are found in the compounds *Lummini-gāma* and *āma-kapota* (Pillar Edict V).

ment and procedure (*daṇḍasamatā* and *vyāvahārasamatā*) as well as diffusion of moral instruction (*dhramanusasti*).

Religious Toleration and the Prevention of Schism in the Buddhist Church

In Rock Edict XII the emperor declares that he "does reverence (*Pūjā*) to men of all sects (*Pāsaṁḍāni*) whether ascetics (*Pavajitāni*) or householders (*Gharastāni*) by gifts and various forms of reverence". That he was sincere in his professions is proved by the Barābar cave dedications in favour of the Ājīvika ascetics, who were more closely connected with the Jainas than with the Buddhists.

The emperor only cared for the "growth of the essence (*Sāra-Vaḍhi*) of the matter in sects". He says that "he who does reverence to his own sect while disparaging the sects of others wholly from attachment to his own, with intent to enhance the splendour of his own sect, in reality by such conduct inflicts the severest injury on his own sect." Concord (or concourse, *Samavāyo*) is praised by him as meritorious (*Samavāyo eva sādhu*).

Just as Aśoka tried to secure concord among the various sects, so he wanted to prevent schism within the Buddhist church. Tradition affirms that a Buddhist Council was convened at Pāṭaliputra in the seventeenth year of his reign for the purpose of suppressing heresy and making a compilation of the true Buddhist doctrine (*Saddhammasaṁgaha*). The Sārnāth Edict and its variants may perhaps be regarded as embodying the resolution of this Council.[1]

Aśoka as a Builder

The gift of cave dwellings to the Ājīvika monks affords us a glimpse into another side of Aśoka's activity. As late

[1] Smith, *Aśoka*, 3rd. ed., p. 55.

as the fifth century A.D., sojourners in Pāṭaliputra were struck with wonder at the magnificence of the emperor's architectural achievements. Tradition credits him with the construction of a splendid palace besides numerous relic mounds, monasteries and temples. He is actually known to have enlarged the *stūpa* of Konākamana, a 'former Buddha' and a predecessor of Śākyamuni. He also set up 'pillars of morality' *Dharma-stambhas.* Modern critics are eloquent in their praise of the polished surface of his columns and the fine workmanship of their crowning sculptures.[1]

Character of Aśoka—His Success and Failure

Aśoka is one of the most interesting personalities in the history of India. He had the energy of a Chandragupta, the versatility of a Samudragupta and the catholicity of an Akbar. He was tireless in his exertion and unflagging in his zeal—all directed to the promotion of the spiritual and material welfare of his people whom he looked upon as his children. His illustrious grandfather was accustomed to dispose of cases even when indulging in the luxury of a massage of the limbs. Similarly, Aśoka used to listen to reports about the affairs of his people even while 'he was eating, in the harem, in the inner apartment, at the cowpen, in the palanquin and in the parks'. The great soldier who had brought under subjection a huge territory unconquered even by his ever victorious grandfather, could, at the same time, argue points of doctrine and discipline with a fraternity of erudite monks. The statesman who could pilot an empire through the storm and stress of a war that involved the death and deportation of hundreds of thousands of men was, at the same time, capable of organizing religious missions the sphere of whose activities embraced three continents, and transforming a local sect in the Ganges Valley into one of the great reli-

[1] For Aśoka's achievements in the domain of art, see Smith, *HFAIC*, 13, 57ff; *Aśoka*, pp. 107ff; *CHI*, 618ff; Havell, *ARI*, 104ff, etc.

gions of the world. The man who penetrated into the jungles of the Nepalese Tarai to pay homage to the birthplace of the Buddhas, bore no ill-will towards the descendants of their Brāhmaṇa and Jaina opponents, and granted cave-dwellings to the adherents of a rival sect. The king who undertook tours with the object of granting largesses of gold to Brāhmaṇas and *Śramaṇas*, admitted to office *Yavanas* in whose country there were neither Brāhmaṇas nor Śramaṇas. He preached the virtues of concord and toleration in an age when religious feeling ran high and disruptive influences were at work within the fold of the Jaina and Buddhist churches. He preached non-violence when violence in war, religious ritual, royal pastime and festive gatherings was the order of the day. He eschewed military conquest not after defeat but after victory and pursued a policy of patience and gentleness while still possessed of the resources of a mighty empire. The forbearance of this strong man was only matched by his truthfulness, and he describes in burning words which no Kaliṅga patriot could have improved upon, the terrible misery that he had inflicted on a hapless province. The example of Dharmāśoka, the pious king, exercised an ennobling influence on posterity. In the second century A.D. Queen Gautamī Balaśrī takes pride in the fact that her son was "alien to hurting life even towards an offending enemy" (*Kitāparādhe pi satujane apānahisāruchi*). Even in the fifth century A.D., the rest-houses and free hospitals of Magadha excited the wonder and admiration of foreigners. The benefactions of Dharmāśoka were a source of inspiration to royal personages as late as the time of Govindachandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty.

We have already seen that the political record of the great Maurya's early years was brilliant. His reign saw the final triumph of those centripetal forces that had been at work since the days of Bimbisāra. The conquest of Kaliṅga completed the unification of non-Tamil India under the hegemony of Magadha. The dream of a United Jambudvīpa was nearly realised.

But the policy of *Dhamma-vijaya* which he formulated after the Kaliṅga War was not likely to promote the cause for which a long line of able sovereigns from Bimbisāra to Bindusāra had lived and struggled. The statesman who turned civil administrators into religious propagandists, abolished hunting and jousts of arms, entrusted the fierce tribesmen on the North-West Frontier and in the wilds of the Deccan to the tender care of "superintendents of piety" and did not rest till the sound of the kettle-drum was completely hushed and the only sound that was heard was that of moral teaching, certainly pursued a policy at which Chandragupta Maurya would have looked askance. Dark clouds were looming in the north-western horizon. India needed men of the calibre of Puru and Chandragupta to ensure her protection against the Yavana menace. She got a dreamer. Magadha after the Kaliṅga War frittered away her conquering energy in attempting a religious revolution, as Egypt did under the guidance of Ikhnaton. The result was politically disastrous as will be shown in the next section. Aśoka's attempt to end war met with the same fate as the similar endeavour of President Wilson.

According to Dr. Smith's chronology Aśoka died in 232 B.C., after a reign of about 40 years. A Tibetan tradition is said to affirm that the great Emperor breathed his last at Taxila.[1]

SECTION II. THE LATER MAURYAS AND THE DECLINE OF THEIR POWER

The Magadha Empire under Aśoka extended from the foot of the Hindukush to the borders of the Tamil country. But the withdrawal of the strong arm of Piyadasi was perhaps the signal for the disintegration of this mighty monarchy. "His sceptre was the bow of Ulysses which could not be drawn by any weaker hand." The provinces fell off one by one. Foreign barbarians began to pour

[1] *The Oxford History of India*, p. 116. I cannot vouch for the authenticity of this tradition.

across the north-western gates of the empire, and a time came when the proud monarchs of Pataliputra and Rājagriha (and Malwa) had to bend their knees before the despised provincials of 'Andhra' and Kaliṅga.

Unfortunately, no Megasthenes or Kauṭilya has left any account of the later Mauryas. It is impossible to reconstruct a detailed history of Aśoka's successors from the scanty data furnished by one or two inscriptions and a few Brāhmaṇical, Jaina and Buddhist works.

Aśoka had many children. In Pillar Edict VII, he pays attention to the distribution of alms made by all his children, and in particular to those made by the "Princes, sons of the Queens". It is to this last category that belonged some of the *Kumāras* who represented the Imperial authority at Takshaśilā, Ujjayinî and Tosalī. **Tīvara**[1] the son of queen Kāruvāki, the only prince actually named in the inscriptions, does not appear to have mounted the imperial throne. Three other sons, namely, Mahendra, Kunāla (Dharma-vivardhana, Suyaśas?), and Jalauka are mentioned in literature. It is, however, uncertain whether Mahendra was a son of Aśoka or his brother.

The *Vāyu Purāṇa* says that after Aśoka's death his son **Kunāla** reigned for eight years. Kunāla's son and successor was Bandhupālita, and Bandhupālita's *dāyāda* or heir was Indrapālita. After Indrapālita came Devavarman, Satadhanus and Bṛihadratha.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* gives the following list of Aśoka's successor:—Daśaratha, Samprati, Śatadhanvan and Bṛihadratha.

The *Vishṇu Purāṇa* furnishes the following names:—Suyaśas, Daśaratha, Saṅgata, Śāliśūka, Somaśarman Śatadhanvan and Bṛihadratha.

The *Divyāvadāna*[2] has the following list:—Saṁpadî, Vṛihaspati, Vṛishasena, Pushyadharman and Pushyamitra.

[1] For Tīvara as a Magadhan name see *The Book of Kindred Sayings*, II, pp. 128-30.

[2] P. 433.

Jaina writers refer to a Maurya king of Rājagṛiha, named Balabhadra.[1]

The *Rājataraṅginī* mentions **Jalauka** as the successor of Aśoka in Kaśmīra, while Tāranātha mentions another successor Vīrasena who ruled in Gandhāra and was, as Dr. Thomas suggests, probably the predecessor of **Subhāgasana** of Polybius.[2]

It is not an easy task to reconcile the divergent versions of the different authorities. The reality of the existence of Kunāla is established by the combined testimony of the Purāṇic and Buddhist works (which represent him as the father of Saṁpadī) as well as the evidence of Hemchandra and Jinaprabhasuri, the well-known Jaina writers. The names Dharma-vivardhana occurring in the *Divyāvadāna* and the Records of Fa Hien and Suyaśas found in the *Vishṇu* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* were probably *birudas* or epithets of this prince. Tradition is not unanimous regarding the accession of Kunāla to the imperial throne. He is reputed to have been blind. His position was, therefore, probably like that of Dhṛitarāshṭra of the Great Epic and, though nominally regarded as the sovereign, he was physically unfit to carry on the work of government which was presumably entrusted to his favourite son Samprati, who is described by Jaina and Buddhist writers as the immediate successor of Aśoka.

Kunāla's son was Bandhupālita according to the *Vāyū Purāṇa*, *Saṁpadī* (Samprati) according to the *Divyāvadāna* and the *Pāṭaliputrakalpa* of Jinaprabhasuri,[3] and Vigataśoka according to Tāranātha.[4] Either these princes were identical or they were brothers. If the latter view be correct then Bandhupālita may have been identical with **Daśaratha** whose reality is established by the brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of cave-dwellings at the Nāgārjuni Hills which he bestowed upon

[1] Jacobi, *Introduction to the Kalpasūtra of Bhadrabāhu*, 1879, p. 9.
[2] *Ind. Ant.*, 1875, p. 362; *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I, p. 512.
[3] See also *Pariśishṭaparvan*, IX, 51-53.
[4] *Ind. Ant.*, 1875, p. 362.

the *Ājīvikas*. Daśaratha, who receives the epithet "*devānaṁpiya*" in the inscriptions, was a grandson of Aśoka according to the *Matsya* and *Vishṇu* Purāṇas, and the predecessor of Samprati (variant Saṅgata) according to the same authorities.

Indrapālita must be identified with **Samprati** or Śāliśūka according as we identify Bandhupālita with Daśaratha or Samprati. "In the matter of the propagation of the Jaina faith, Jaina records speak as highly of Samprati as Buddhist records do of Aśoka." The *Pāṭaliputrakalpa* of Jinaprabhasuri[1] says, "in Pāṭaliputra flourished the great king Samprati, son of Kunāla, lord of Bhārata with its three continents (*trikhaṇḍaṁ Bharatakshetraṁ Jināyatanamaṇḍitam*), the great *Arhanta* who established *Vihāras* for *Śramaṇas* even in non-Aryan countries."

Dr. Smith shows good grounds for believing that the dominions of Samprati included Avanti and Western India.[2] In his *Aśoka*[3] he admits that the hypothesis that Aśoka left two grandsons, of whom one (Daśaratha) succeeded him in his eastern and the other (Samprati) in his western dominions, is little more than a guess.[4] The Jaina writers represent Samprati as ruling over Pāṭaliputra as well as Ujjayinī. His name is mentioned in the Purāṇic list of Aśoka's *Magadhan* successors.

The existence of **Śāliśūka** is proved not only by the testimony of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* but also by that of the *Gārgī Saṁhitā*[5] and the *Vāyu* manuscript referred to

[1] Bomb., Gaz , I i, 6-15. *Pariśishṭa*, XI. 65.

[2] *Pariśishṭaparvan*, xi 23 itaścha Samprati nṛpo yayāv Ujjayinīṁ purīm.

[3] Third ed., p 70

[4] Curiously enough, Prof Dhruva maintains in spite of this and the clear evidence of Jaina literature that "historians say that on the death of Kunāla there was a partition of the Maurya Empire between his two sons Daśaratha and Samprati (*JBORS*, 1930, 30)." Prof. Dhruva's emendations of the text of the *Yugapurāṇa* are largely conjectural and of little probative value

[5] Kern's *Brihatsaṁhitā*, p. 37. The *Gārgī Saṁhitā* says, "There will be *Śāliśūka*, a wicked quarrelsome king. Unrighteous, although theorising

by Pargiter. He may have been identical with Vṛihaspati, son of Samprati, according to the *Divyāvadāna*, unless Vṛihaspati represented a different branch of the imperial family.

Devavarman and Somaśarman are variant readings of the same name. The same is the case with Śatadhanus[1] and Śatadhanvan. It is not easy to identify Vṛishasena and Pushyadharman; they may be merely *birudas* or secondary names of Devavarman and Śatadhanvan. But the possibility that they represent a distinct branch of the Maurya line is not entirely excluded.

The last of the Imperial Mauryas of Magadha, **Bṛihadratha,** is mentioned not only in the *Purāṇas* but also in Bāṇa's *Harsha-charita*. He was crushed by his general Pushyamitra who is perhaps wrongly described by the *Divyāvadāna* as of Maurya descent. A Maurya minister is said to have been imprisoned by the regicide family.

Petty Maurya kings continued to rule in Western India as well as Magadha long after the extinction of the Imperial line. King Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty is referred to in the Kaṇaswa inscription of A.D. 738.[2] Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar identifies him with Dhavalappadeva, the overlord of Dhanika, mentioned in the Dabok (Mewar) inscription of *cir.* A.D 725.[3] Maurya chiefs of the Koṅkaṇ and Khāndesh are referred to in Early Chalukya and Yādava epigraphs.[4] A Maurya ruler of Magadha named Pūrṇavarman is mentioned by Hiuen Tsang.

on righteousness, *dharmavādi adhārmikah (sic)* he cruely oppresses his country."

[1] For an interesting account of a King named Śatadhanu see *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, III. 18 51, *Bhāg*, 11 8 44 His identity is, however, uncertain.

[2] *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, 163; *Bomb. Gaz.*, I. Part 2, p. 284. Kaṇaswa is in the Kotah State, Rājputāna. It is not unlikely that Dhavala was a descendant of some princely Viceroy of Ujjain. See also reference to the Mauryas in the Navasārikā grant, Fleet, *DKD*, 375.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, XII, p. 11. But see Ep. XX. 122. The date A.D. 725 is not accepted by other scholars who prefer A.D. 813.

[4] *Bomb. Gaz.*, I, Part 2, pp. 283, 284. Buhler suggests (*Ep. Ind.*, III, p 136) that these Maurya chieftains of the Koṅkaṇ were probably descendants of the princely Viceroy of the Deccan. He also draws our attention to the family name 'More' which is met with in the Mahratta country, and is apparently a corruption of 'Maurya'.

There can be no doubt that during the sovereignty of the later Mauryas the Magadha Empire experienced a gradual decay. Aśoka died in or about the year 232 B.C. Within a quarter of a century after his death a Greek army crossed the Hindukush which was the Maurya frontier in the days of Chandragupta and his grandson. The *Yuga Purāṇa* section of the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* bears testimony to the **decline of the Maurya power** in the **Madhyadeśa after the reign of Sāliśūka :**

Tataḥ Sāketam ākramya
Pañchālān Mathurāṁstathā
Yavanā dushṭavikrāntāḥ
prāpsyanti Kusumadhvajam
tataḥ Pushpapure[1] *prāpte*
kardame prathite hite
ākulā vishayāḥ sarve
bhavishyanti na saṁśayaḥ[2].

"Then the viciously valiant Greeks, after reducing Sāketa (in Oudh), the Pañchāla country and Mathurā, will reach (or take) Kusumadhvaja. Pushpapura (Pāṭaliputra) being reached....all provinces will undoubtedly be in disorder."

Where was now the power that had expelled the prefects of Alexander and hurled back the battalions of Seleukos?

According to Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasād Śāastrī[3] a **reaction promoted by the Brāhmanas** had sapped the foundations of the Maurya authority and dismembered the empire.

Among the causes of the alienation of the Brāhmaṇas the foremost place is given to Aśoka's Edict against

[1] Cf. Strabo, XV. I. 27—"We became acquainted with the eastern parts of India on this side of the Hypanis and whatever parts beside which have been described by those who after Alexander advanced beyond the Hypanis to the Ganges and Palibothra".

[2] Kern, *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*, p. 37.

[3] *JASB*, 1910, pp. 259ff.

animal sacrifices. The Edict, in Paṇḍit Śāstrī's opinion, was certainly directed against the Brāhmaṇas as a class and was specially offensive because it was promulgated by a *Śudra* ruler. As to the first point we should remember that prohibition of animal sacrifices did not necessarily imply hostility towards Brāhmaṇas. Long before Aśoka Brāhmaṇa sages whose teachings have found a place in the Holy *Śruti*, the most sacred literature of the Brāhmaṇas, declared themselves in no uncertain terms against sacrifices, and in favour of *Ahiṁsā* (non-violence). In the *Muṇḍaka Upanishad*[1] we have the following *Śloka*: —

> *Plavā hyete adṛidhā yajñarūpā*
> *ashṭādaśoktam avaraṁ yeshu karma*
> *etachchhreyo ye'bhinandanti mūḍhā*
> *jarāmṛityuṁ te punarevāpi yanti.*

"Frail, in truth are those boats, the sacrifices, the eighteen in which this lower ceremonial has been told. Fools, who praise this as the highest good, are subject again and again to old age and death." In the *Chhāndogya Upanishad*[2] Ghora Āṅgirasa lays great stress on *Ahiṁsā*.

As to the second statement we should remember that tradition is not unanimous in representing the Mauryas as of *Śūdra* extraction. Certain *Purāṇic* texts assert no doubt, that after Mahāpadma there will be kings of *Śūdra* origin.[3] But this statement cannot be taken to mean that *all* the post-Mahāpadman kings were *Śūdras*, as in that case the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas also will have to be classed as *Śūdras*.[4] The *Mudrārākshasa*, the evidence

[1] I. 2. 7. SBE, *The Upanishads*, pt. II, p. 31.

[2] III. 17. 4.

[3] *Tataḥ prabhṛitirājāno bhavishyāḥ Śūdrayonayaḥ.* The reading in other texts is, however, *Tato nṛipā bhavishyanti Śūdraprāyāstvadhārmikāḥ* (DKA, 25).

[4] Among real Śūdra (or partially Śūdra) kings may be included the Nandas, a few rulers mentioned in the *Garuḍa Purāṇa* (Ch. 145. 4) and the *Si-yu-ki* of Hiuen Tsang (Watters, I. 322; II. 252), and certain princes of Western India and the Indus Valley mentioned on pp. 54-55 of Pargiter's *Dynasties of the Kali Age*.

of which is cited to prove that Chandragupta was a *Śūdra*,[1] is a late work, and its evidence is contradicted by earlier authorities. As already pointed out above[2] the *Mahāparinibbāna sutta* represents the Moriyas (Mauryas) as belonging to the *Kshatriya* caste. The *Mahāvaṁsa*[3] refers to the Moriyas as a noble (*kshatriya*) clan and represents Chandragupta as a scion of this clan. In the *Divyāvadāna*[4] Bindusāra, son of Chandragupta, said to a girl, "*Tvaṁ Nāpinī ahaṁ Rāja Kshatriyo Mūrdhābhishiktaḥ kathaṁ mayā sārdhaṁ samāgamo bhavishyati?*" "Thou art a barber girl, I am a consecrated *kshatriya* (king). How can I unite myself with thee?" In the same work[5] Aśoka says to one of his queens (Tishyarakshitā), "*Devi ahaṁ Kshatriyaḥ katham palāṇḍuṁ paribhakshayāmi?*" 'Queen, I am a *kshatriya*, how can I take onion?' In a Mysore inscription Chandragupta is described as "an abode of the usages of eminent kshatriyas".[6] The *Kauṭilīya's* preference of an "*abhijāta*" king seems also to suggest

[1] In the play Chandragupta is styled '*Nandānvaya*' and *Vrishala*. As to the former appellation we should note that the play describes Nanda as *abhijana*. Further it calls Chandragupta *Mauryaputra*, and though commentators try to reconcile the epithets *Nandānvaya* and *Mauryaputra*, we learn from early Buddhist writers that Maurya is not a metronymic of Chandragupta or of his father, but the designation of an old clan. The Greeks, too, refer to a tribe called Morieis (Weber, *IA*, ii (1873), p. 148; Max Müller, *Sans. Lit.*, 280; Cunn., *JASB*, XXIII, 680). As to the epithet *Vṛishala* it should be remembered that a Purāṇic text applies it even to the founder of the so-called Andhra dynasty (Pargiter, *DKA*, 38). But we learn from contemporary epigraphs that the dynasty regarded itself as '*Bamhaṇa*'. According to Manu (X. 43) the epithet *Vṛishala* could be applied to degraded *Kshatriyas* (*Cf.* IHQ, 1930, 271ff. *Cf.* also *Mbh.* XII. 90, 15ff., "The Blessed *Dharma* is *Vṛisha* He who deals with it in such a way that it ceases to be of any use, *i.e.*, transgresses it, is called a *Vṛishala*, *Vṛishohi Bhagavān Dharmo yastasya kurute hyalam*). The Mauryas by their Greek connection and Jaina and Buddhist leanings certainly deviated from the *Dharma* as understood by the great Brāhmaṇa law-givers. Attention may be invited in this connection to the epithet *Vasalaka* (*Vṛishala*) applied by Brāhmaṇas to the Buddha himself (Mookerji, *Hindu Civilization*, 264).

[2] P. 267 *supra*.

[3] Geiger's Translation, p. 27.

[4] P. 370.

[5] P. 409.

[6] Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 10.

that the sovereign of the reputed author was born of a noble family.[1]

Having referred to the prohibition of animal sacrifices Paṇḍit Śāstrī goes on to say: "this was followed by another edict in which Aśoka boasted that those who were regarded as gods on earth have been reduced by him into false gods. If it means anything it means that the Brāhmaṇas who were regarded as *Bhūdevas* or gods on earth had been shown up by him."

The original passage referred to above runs thus:—

Y (i)-imāya kālāya Jambudipasi amisā devā husu te dāni m (i) s-kaṭā.

Paṇḍit Śāstrī followed the interpretation of Senart. But Sylvian Lévi[2] has shown that the word *amisā* cannot stand for Sanskrit *amṛishā*, for in the Bhābrū edict we find *Musā* and not *Misā* for Sanskrit *mṛishā* (falsely or false). The recently discovered Māski version reads *misibhūtā* for *misamkaṭā*, showing that the original form was *miśrībhūtā*. It will be grammatically incorrect to form *misibhūtā* from Sanskrit *mṛishā*. The word *miśra* means mixed. And *miśrībhūtā* means "made to mix" or made to associate. The meaning of the entire passage is "during that time the men in India who had been unassociated with the gods became associated with them."[3] There is thus no question of "showing up" anybody.[4]

Paṇḍit Śāstrī adds that the appointment by Aśoka of *Dharma-mahāmātras*, *i.e.*, of superintendents of morals,

[1] *Cf. Arthaśāstra*, p. 326. See also *supra*, 266 f. (the reign of Chandragupta)

[2] Hultzsch, *Aśoka*, 168.

[3] *Cf. Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, II. 7. 16. 1· "Formerly men and gods lived together in this world. Then the gods in reward of their sacrifices went to heaven, but men were left behind. Those men who perform sacrifices in the same manner as the gods did, dwell with the gods and Brahma in heaven." My attention was first drawn to this passage by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar. *Cf.* also *Harivaṁśa* (III 32. 1)· "*Devatānāṁ manushyānāṁ sahavāsobhavattadā*;" and *SBE*, XXXIV, p. 222-3 (Śaṅkara's Com. on the *Vedāntasūtras*): "The men of ancient times, in consequence of their eminent religious merit, conversed with the gods face to face. *Smṛiti* also declares that 'from the reading of the *Veda* there results intercourse with the favourite divinity.' "

[4] The true import of the passage was pointed out by Dr. Bhandarkar in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1912, p. 170.

was a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. It is hardly correct to represent the *Dharma-mahāmātras* as mere superintendents of morals when their duties consisted in the establishment of the Law of Piety (which included liberality to Brāhmaṇas), the promotion of the welfare of the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gandhāras, Risṭikas, Brāhmaṇas and others, revision of sentences of imprisonment or execution, the supervision of the family establishments of the Emperor's brothers and other relatives, and the administration of alms-giving.[1] These duties were not essentially those of a mere superintendent of morals, and were not a direct invasion of the rights and privileges of the Brāhmaṇas. Moreover, there is nothing to show that the *Dharma-mahāmātras* were wholly recruited from non-Brāhmaṇas.

Our attention is next drawn to the passage where Aśoka insists upon his officers strictly observing the principles of *Daṇḍa-samatā* and *Vyavahāra-samatā*. Paṇḍit Śāstrī takes the expressions to mean 'equality of punishment' and 'equality in lawsuits' irrespective of caste, colour and creed, and adds that this order was very offensive to the Brāhmaṇas who claimed many privileges including immunity from capital punishment.

The passage containing the expressions *Daṇḍ-asamatā* and *Vyavahāra-samatā* should not be divorced from its context and interpreted as if it were an isolated *ukase*. We quote the passage with the context below:—

"To my *Rājūkas* set over many hundred thousands of people I have granted independence (or discretion) in the award of honours and penalties. But as it is desirable that there should be uniformity in judicial procedure (*Vyavahāra-samatā*) and uniformity in penalties (*Daṇḍa-samatā*), from this time forward my rule is this—'To condemned men lying in prison under sentence of death a respite of three days is granted by me'."

It is clear from the extract quoted above that the

[1] *Aśoka* 3rd. ed., pp. 168-69.

order regarding *Vyavahāra-samatā* and *Daṇḍa-samatā* is to be understood in connection with the general policy of decentralisation which the Emperor introduced. Aśoka allowed discretion to the *Rājūkas* in the award of penalties, but he did not like that the *Daṇḍa* and *Vyavahāra* prevalent within the jurisdiction of one *Rājūka* should be entirely different from those prevailing within the jurisdiction of others.[1] He wanted to maintain some uniformity (*samatā*) both in *Daṇḍa* (penalties) as well as in *Vyavahāra* (legal procedure). As an instance he refers to the rule about the granting of a respite of three days to condemned men. The *Samatā* which he enforced involved a curtailment of the autonomy of the *Rājūkas* and did not necessarily infringe on the alleged immunity of the Brāhmaṇas from capital punishment.

But were the Brāhmaṇas really immune under all circumstances from capital punishment in ancient India? We learn from the *Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa*[2] that a *Purohita* (priest) might be punished with death for treachery to his master. The *Kauṭilīya*[3] tells us that a Brāhmaṇa guilty of treason was to be drowned. Readers of the *Mahābhārata* are familiar with the stories of the punishments inflicted on Māṇḍavya and Likhita.[4] The life of a Brāhmaṇa was not so sacrosanct in ancient as in mediaeval and modern India. We learn from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* that king Hariśchandra of the Ikshvāku family did not scruple to offer a Brāhmaṇa boy as a victim in a sacrifice.

Against the surmises regarding the anti-Brāhmaṇical policy of Aśoka we have the positive evidence of some of his inscriptions which proves the Emperor's solicitude for the well-being of the Brāhmaṇas. Thus in Rock Edict III he inculcates liberality to Brāhmaṇas. In Edict IV he speaks with disapproval of unseemly behaviour towards

[1] I am indebted for this suggestion to Mr. S. N. Majumdar.

[2] *Vedic Index*, II, p. 84. The story of Kutsa and his chaplain, Caland, *Pañch. Br.*, XIV. 6.8; *cf. Bṛihadāraṇyaka Up.*, III, 9. 26.

[3] P. 229.

[4] *Ādi*, 107 and *Śānti*, 23, 36.

the same class. In Edict V he refers to the employment of *Dharma-mahāmātras* to promote the welfare and happiness of the Brāhmaṇas.

Paṇḍit Śastrī says further that as soon as the strong hand of Aśoka was removed the Brāhmaṇas seemed to have stood against his successors. We have no evidence of any such conflict between the children of Aśoka and the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, if the Brāhmaṇa historian of Kaśmīra is to be believed, the relations between Jalauka, one of the sons and successors of Aśoka, and the Brāhmaṇical Hindus were entirely friendly.[1]

In conclusion Paṇḍit Śastrī refers to the assassination of the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha by Pushyamitra Śuṅga and says, "We clearly see the hands of the Brāhmaṇas in the great revolution." But the Buddhist remains at Bhārhut erected "during the sovereignty of the Śuṅgas" do not bear out the theory which represents them as the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism Are inferences deduced from uncorroborated writings of late authors like the compiler of the *Divyāvadāna* and perhaps Tāranātha, to be preferred to the clear testimony of contemporary monuments? Even admitting that Pushyamitra was a militant Brāhmaṇist we fail to see how the decay and dismemberment of the Maurya empire can be attributed primarily to him or to his Brāhmaṇist followers. The empire was a shrivelled and attenuated carcase long

[1] Note also the employment of Brāhmaṇa officers, *e.g.*, Pushyamitra, by the later Mauryas. Kalhaṇa has nothing but praise for Aśoka. Another Brāhmaṇa writer, Bāṇa, applies the epithet *anārya* (ignoble) not to the Maurya kings, but to the Brāhmaṇa general who overthrew the last of them. Viśākhadatta compares Chandragupta with the Boar Incarnation of Vishṇu. Certain epic and Purāṇic writers, it is true, refer to the Mauryas as *asuras*, and the *Gārgī-Saṁhitā* draws pointed attention to the oppressive rule of some of the later members of the family. But there is little to suggest that the Brāhmaṇas were special victims of Maurya tyranny. On the contrary, members of the class were freely admitted to high office as evidenced by the case of Pushyamitra. The epithet *asura* or *sura-dvish* was applied not only to the Mauryas but to all persons 'beguiled by the Buddha.' The testimony of the Purāṇas in this respect is contradicted by that of contemporary epigraphs which refer to Aśoka and the only one among his imperial descendants who has left any epigraphic record as *devānaṁpiya*, that is, the beloved (and not the enemy) of the gods.

before Pushyamitra's *coup d'etat* of *c.* 187 B.C. We learn from the *Rājataraṅginī* that immediately after the death of Aśoka one of his own sons, **Jalauka,** made himself independent in Kaśmīra and conquered the plains including Kanauj. If Tāranātha is to be believed another prince, Vīrasena, apparently wrested Gandhāra from the hands of the feeble successor of the great Maurya at Pāṭaliputra. The virtual secession of Vidarbha or Berar is vouched for by the *Mālavikāgnimitram* of Kālidāsa. The loss of the northern provinces is confirmed by Greek evidence. We learn from Polybius that about 206 B.C., there ruled over them a king named Sophagasenus, **Subhāgasena,** probably a successor of Vīrasena. We quote the passage referring to the king below:—

"He (Antiochos the Great) crossed the Caucasus (Hindukush) and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenus, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army, leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."

It will be seen that Subhāgasena was a king and not a petty chief of the Kabul valley as Dr. Smith would have us believe. He is called "king of the Indians," a title which was applied by the classical writers to great kings like Chandragupta and Demetrios. There is nothing in the account of Polybius to show that he was vanquished by the Syrian king in war or was regarded by the latter as a subordinate ruler. On the contrary, the statement that Antiochos "renewed his friendship (or alliance) with Sophagasenus, king of the Indians" proves that the two monarchs met on equal terms and friendly relations were established between them. The renewal of friendship on the part of the Greek king, and the surrender of elephants on the part of his Indian brother, only remind us of the relations subsisting between Chandragupta and Seleukos. "The Antiochos-Sophagasenus alliance may

also have been directed *against* the Imperial Mauryas of Pāṭaliputra." Greek intrigue may have played a part in the disintegration of the empire before the Greek raids. Further the expression "renewal of friendship" seems to suggest that Subhāgasena had had previous dealings with Antiochos. Consequently he must have come to the throne sometime before 206 B.C. The existence of an independent kingdom in the north-west before 206 B.C. shows that the Maurya Empire must have begun to break up nearly a quarter of a century before the usurpation of Pushyamitra.

We have seen that the theory which ascribes the decline and dismemberment of the Maurya Empire to a Brāhmaṇical revolution led by Pushyamitra does not bear scrutiny. Was the Maurya disruption due primarily to the Greek invasion? The earliest Greek invasion after Aśoka, that of Antiochos the Great, took place about 206 B.C., and we have seen that the combined testimony of Kalhaṇa and Polybius leaves no room for doubt that the dissolution of the empire began long before the raid of the Hellenistic monarch.

What then were the primary causes of the disintegration of the mighty empire? There are good grounds for believing that the government of the outlying provinces by the imperial officials was oppressive. Already in the time of Bindusāra ministerial oppression had goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The *Divyāvadāna* says[1]

"Atha Rājño Vindusārasya Takshasilā nāma nagaraṁ viruddham. Tatra Rājñā Vindusāren Āśoko visarjitaḥ . . . yāvat Kumāraśchaturaṅgena balakāyena Takshaśilāṁ gataḥ, śrutvā Takshaśilā nivāsinaḥ paurāḥ . . . pratyudgamya cha kathayanti 'na vayam Kumārasya viruddhāḥ nāpi Rājño Vindusārasya api tu dushṭāmātyā asmākaṁ paribhavaṁ kurvanti'."

"Now Taxila, a city of king Bindusāra's, revolted. The king Bindusāra despatched Aśoka there. . .while the prince

[1] P. 371.

was nearing Taxila with the fourfold army, the resident *Pauras* (citizens of Taxila), on hearing of it. . .came out to meet him and said:—'We are not opposed to the prince nor even to king Bindusāra. But these wicked ministers insult us'."

Taxila again revolted during the reign of Aśoka and the cause was again the tyranny of the ministers. *Rājñ-ośokasy-ottarāpathe Takshaśilā nagaram viruddham* . . ."[1] Prince Kunāla was deputed to the government of the city. When the prince went there the people said "*na vayaṁ Kumārasya viruddhā na rājño'-śokasy-āpi tu dushṭātmāno' mātyā āgatyāsmākam apamānaṁ kurvanti.*"

The *Divyāvadāna* is no doubt a late work, but the reality of ministerial oppression to which it refers, is affirmed by Aśoka himself in the Kaliṅga Edicts. Addressing the High officers (*Mahāmātras*) in charge of Tosalī he says: "All men are my children; and just as I desire for my children that they may enjoy every kind of prosperity and happiness both in this world and in the next, so also I desire the same for all men. You, however, do not grasp this truth to its full extent. Some individual, perchance, pays heed, but to a part only, not the whole. See then to this, for the principle of government is well-established. Again, it happens that some individual incurs imprisonment or torture and when the result is his imprisonment without due cause, many other people are deeply grieved. . . Ill performance of duty can never gain my regard . . . The restraint or torture of the townsmen may not take place without due cause. And for this purpose, in accordance with the Law of Piety, I shall send forth in rotation every five years such persons as are of mild and temperate disposition, and regardful of the sanctity of life . . . From Ujjain, however, the Prince for this purpose will send out a similar body of officials, and will not over-pass three years. In the same way—from Taxila."[2]

From the concluding words of the Edict it appears that official maladministration was not confined to the

[1] *Divyāvadāna*, 407f.

[2] Smith, *Aśoka*, 3rd Ed., pp. 194-96.

province of Kaliṅga. The state of affairs at Ujjain and Taxila was similar. It is thus clear that the loyalty of the provincials was being slowly undermined by ministerial oppression long before Pushyamitra's *coup d' etat* of c. 187 B.C.[1] and the Greek invasion of c. 206 B.C. Aśoka no doubt did his best to check the evil, but he was ill served by his officers. It is significant that the provincials of the north-west—the very people who complained of the oppression of the *dushṭāmātyas* as early as the reign of Bindusāra, were among the first to break away from the Maurya empire.

The Magadhan successors of Aśoka had neither the strength nor perhaps the will to arrest the process of disruption.[2] The martial ardour of imperial Magadha had vanished with the last cries of agony uttered in the battle-fields of Kaliṅga. Aśoka had given up the aggressive militarism of his forefathers and had evolved a policy of *Dhamma-vijaya* which must have seriously impaired the military efficiency of his empire.[3] He had called upon his

[1] The Jaina date 313 − 108 = 205 B.C. for Pushyamitra's accession may refer to the assumption of power by Pushyamitra in Avanti, while the date c. 187 B.C. refers to the dynastic revolution in Magadha.

[2] On the contrary, if the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* is to be believed, one of his successors, namely Śāliśūka, actually quickened the pace by his tyranny—*Sarāshṭra mardate ghoraṁ dharmavādi adhārmikaḥ* (*sic*). Some of Aśoka's descendants (*e.g.*, Jalauka) set up independe sovereignties, and were thus directly responsible for the dismemberment of the empire.

[3] *Cf.* the events narrated on page 353 f. *ante*, and "Garga's" attack on the policy of *so-called* Dharmavijaya, "conquest conformable to Dharma" attributed to Śāliśūka, which, in the opinion of the present writer, is hard to dissociate from *Dhamma-Vijaya* as promulgated by Aśoka himself and recommended for adoption by his "sons and even great-grandsons." Attention to the passage in the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* was also drawn by Jayaswal (*JBORS*, IV. 261)—*sthāpayishyati mohātmā vijayaṁ nāma dhāmikam*, "the fool will establish the so-called conquest of Dharma". The expression *mohātmā* reminds one of the later meaning of '*Devānaṁpiya*' (fool, idiot like a brute, beast, Apte, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 510). An eminent writer takes Vijaya to be a proper name, the appellation of the elder brother of Śāliśūka, whom the latter established on the throne. But it is not clear why the enthronement of a righteous (*dhārmika*) man should earn for the person responsible for the action the opprobrious epithet *mohātmā*. Besides, Vijaya does not occur as a royal name in any of the lists of later Mauryas known to tradition. (For reference to divergent views see *Cal. Rev.*, Feb., 1943, p. 123ff; Feb., 1946 p. 79ff). As

sons and even great-grandsons to eschew new conquests, avoid the shedding of blood and take pleasure in patience and forbearance as far as possible. These latter had heard more of *Dhamma-ghosha* than of *Bheri-ghosha*. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that the *rois faineants* who succeeded to the imperial throne of Pāṭaliputra proved unequal to the task of maintaining the integrity of the mighty fabric reared by the genius of Chandragupta and his Chancellor.

The disintegration which set in before 206 B.C. was accelerated by the invasions led by the *Yavanas* referred to in the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* and the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali. The final *coup de grace* was given by Pushyamitra the Baimbika.

pointed out by Dr. Sircar, conjectural emendations of the text of the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* in support of a particular theory do not carry conviction (*Cal. Rev.* 1943, April, 39ff).

The royal hunt and jousts of arms in *Samājas* were abolished. The army seems to have been practically inactive during the last 29 years of Aśoka's reign as the emperor himself declares with a feeling of exultation that 'the sound of the *bheri* had become the sound of the True Law, *Dharma*.' The Chinese *Hou Hanshu* (quoted by S. Konow, CII, Vol. II, p. lxvii) testifies to the fact that people of India "practise the religion of the Buddha; it has *become a habit with them not to kill and to fight*." The ease with which general Pushyamitra overthrew his king, in the very sight of the army, shows that unlike the earlier kings of the dynasty who took the field in person, the last of the Mauryas lost touch with his fighting forces, and ceased to command their affection. The largesses of gold lavished on the religieux must also have crippled the financial resources of the empire. The system of autonomous Rājūkas instituted by Aśoka must have let loose centrifugal forces that his successors were unable to check.

GENEALOGY OF THE MAURYA DYNASTY

CHAPTER VI. THE BAIMBIKA-ŚUNGA EMPIRE AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS

SECTION I. THE REIGN OF PUSHYAMITRA

Satataṁ kampayāmāsa Yavanāneka eva yaḥ
balapaurushasampannān kṛitāstrānamitaujasaḥ
yathāsurān Kālakeyān devo vajradharastathā.
—*Mahābhārata.*[1]

Audbhijjo bhavitā kaśchit senānīḥ Kāśyapo dvijaḥ
aśvamedhaṁ Kaliyuge punaḥ pratyaharishyati.
—*Harivaṁśa*[2]

The Mauryas had done much for Indian unity by bringing the greater part of the country under "one umbrella", by defending it against the generals of Alexander and Seleukos, by establishing a uniform system of administration, by using *Prākṛit* for official purposes throughout the length and breadth of the empire and attempting to knit together the different sections of its composite population by the strong tie of a common *Dharma*. With the fall of the dynasty, Indian history for the time being loses its unity. The command of one single political authority is no longer obeyed from the snowy heights of the Hindukush to the verdant plains of Bengal and the Upper Carnatic. Hordes of outlanders pour through the north-western gates of the country and establish aggressive monarchies in Gandhāra, Western Mālwa and neighbouring regions. The Pañjāb is seized by foreigners and the Deccan by local dynasts. The political connection of the *Madhyadeśa* with the valleys of the Indus and the Godāvarī is temporarily snapped, and the splendour of the Magadhan metropolis is dimmed by the rising glory of Śākala, Vidiśā, Prathishṭhāna and other cities. Brāhmaṇism gains ground in the Ganges valley and the Deccan, while Jainism flour-

[1] II. 4. 23.
[2] III. 2. 40.

ishes in Orissa. The sects of the *Māheśvaras* and the *Bhāgavatas* become powers to reckon with. The study of Sanskrit receives an impetus at the hands of the grammarians of the Madhyadeśa, while Prākṛit literature enjoys the patronage of the courts of Prathishṭhāna and Kuntala in Southern India.

Bṛihadratha, the last Maurya Emperor of Magadha, was, according to the *Purāṇas* and the *Harsha-charita*, assassinated by his general, Pushyamitra, who usurped the throne, and founded a new line of kings.

The origin of the usurping family is wrapped up in obscurity. According to the *Divyāvadāna* Pushyamitra was lineally descended from the Mauryas. The *Mālavikāgnimitram*, on the other hand, makes Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, a scion of the **Baimbika** family,[1] while the *Purāṇas*, and apparently the *Harsha-charita*[2] represent these kings as **Śuṅgas.** One writer suggests that the Śuṅgas whose names ended in *Mitra* were Irānians, worshippers of Mithra (the Sun).[3] Others, regard them as Indian Brāhmaṇas. Curiously enough, Pāṇini[4] connects the Śuṅgas with the well-known Brāhmaṇa family of the Bhāradvājas. Śauṅgīputra, "son of a female descendant of Śuṅga", is the name of a teacher in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka*

[1] In the *Mālavikāgnimitram* (Act IV. Verse 14; Tawney's translation, p. 69) Agnimitra claims to belong to the Baimbika-*kula*. A king named Bimbaki is mentioned in *The Ocean of Story*, Penzer I, 112, 119. Mr. H. A. Shah suggests (*Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference*, Madras, p. 379) that the Baimbikas were connected with the family of Bimbisāra. It is more probable that the epithet '*Baimbika*' (in the passage *dākshiṇyaṁ nāma bimbosṭhi Baimbikānāṁ kulavratam*) is connected with *bimbikā*, a kind of plant (*IC*, 1938, Jan., 365) and also perhaps with the river Bimbikā mentioned in the Bharhut Inscriptions (Barua and Sinha, p. 8). *Cf. Pādma, Bhūmikhaṇḍa* 90, 24; Baimbaki in Patañjali, IV, 1. 97. In the *Harivaṁśa* (*Bhavishya*, II. 40) the Brāhmaṇa *Senānī* who is to restore the *Aśvamedha* in the Kali yuga is represented as an *Audbhijja*, 'Plant-born', and a Kāśyapa. Jayaswal identifies him with Pushyamitra. Curiously enough the *Baudhāyana Srauta Sūtra* (ed. Caland, Vol. III, p. 449) represents the *Baiṃbakayaḥ* as Kaśyapas.

[2] It is, however, to be noted that the *Harsha-charita* never applies the designation Śuṅga to Pushyamitra himself, but only to one of the latest kings in the Purāṇic list. The Purāṇas may have combined the Baimbikas and Śuṅgas under the common name of Śuṅga.

[3] *JASB*, 1912, 287. *Cf.* 1910. 260.

[4] In Sūtra IV, 1, 117. Also Kramadīśvara, 763.

Upanishad.[1] Śauṅgāyani, "descendant of Śauṅga" is the name of a teacher in the *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa.* Macdonell and Keith point out that the Śuṅgas are known as teachers in the *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra.*[2] In view of the conflicting statements in the *Mālavikāgnimitram,* the *Purāṇas,* etc., it is difficult to say whether Pushyamitra and his known descendants (down to Vasumitra) were Śuṅgas of the Bhāradvāja *Gotra* or Baimbikas of Kaśyapa lineage. The historic "Śuṅgas" of the time of Dhanabhūti are assigned by competent scholars to the period B.C. 100-75. This accords with the testimony of the *Harsha-charita* which, while denying this dynastic epithet to Pushyamitra, applies it to the latest kings of the Purāṇic list, the immediate predecessors of Vasudeva Kāṇva.

It is not known for certain when and why the family of Pushyamitra, like the Kadambas of a later date, exchanged the quill for the sword. There is no reason to think that Aśoka tyrannised over the Brāhmaṇas and that his oppression forced them to engage in non-priestly pursuits. Brāhmaṇa *Senāpatis* were by no means rare in ancient India.[3] The fact that officers of this class found employment under the Later Mauryas proves conclusively that the latter could not have pursued an anti-Brāhmaṇic policy.

The **Dominions of Pushyamitra** extended to the river Narmadā, and included the cities of Pāṭaliputra, Ayodhyā, Vidiśā, and, if the author of the *Divyāvadāna* and Tāranātha are to be believed, Jālandhara and Śākala.[4] It appears from the *Divyāvadāna,*[5] that the Emperor himself

[1] VI. 4. 31.

[2] XII. 13. 5, etc. The *Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa* seems to associate the Śuṅgas with the Madra country. *Ved. Index,* II, p. 123. For Tāranātha's reference to Pushyamitra, see *JBORS,* IV, pt. 3, 258. For Bhāradvājas as champions of autocracy and of ministerial usurpation, see *Kauṭilīya,* 31, 316.

[3] *Cf.* the cases of Droṇa, Kṛipa and Aśvatthāman in the *Mahābhārata* in ancient times, of Ravideva in the *Indian Antiquary,* VIII. 20, of Kholeśvara, the commander of Yādava kings, and of Someśvara, the Brāhmaṇa general of the Pāla kings.

[4] Jaina writers, *e.g.,* Merutuṅga, include Avanti within the dominions of Pushyamitra. This province was lost to the Sātavāhanas, and Śākala to the Greeks.

[5] P. 434.

continued to reside in Pāṭaliputra. The *Mālavikāgnimitram* tells us that Vidiśā (Besnagar in Eastern Mālwa) was governed by Prince Agnimitra, probably as his father's viceroy (*Goptṛi*).[1] Another viceroy, also a relation of the emperor, may have governed Kosala.[2] Agnimitra's queen had a brother of inferior caste, named Vīrasena. He was placed in command of a frontier fortress on the banks of the Narmadā (*Atthi devie vaṇṇāvaro bhādā Vīraseṇo nāma, so bhaṭṭiṇā antav (p) āladugge Nammadātīre*[3] *ṭhāvida*).

Affairs in the Deccan

It appears from the *Mālavikāgnimitram* that the foundation of the dynasty of Pushyamitra almost synchronised with the establishment of a new kingdom in the Deccan, *viz.*, **Vidarbha** or Berar. Agnimitra's *Amātya* (Minister) refers to the kingdom as *"achirādhishṭhita"*

[1] *Mālavikāgnimitram*, Act V, pp. 370, 391 of G. Vidyānidhi's ed. esp. verse 20. *Saṁpadyate na khalu Goptari nā Agnimitre.*

[2] The possible existence of this viceroyalty is disclosed by an inscription discovered at the door of a temple at Ayodhyā, which records the erection of a "*ketana*" (abode) by a *Kosalādhipa* who was the sixth (brother or descendant?) of *Senāpati* Pushyamitra, the performer of two horse-sacrifices (*Nāgarī Prachāriṇī Patrikā, Vaiśākha*, Sam. 1981; *JBORS*, X (1924) 203; XIII (1927) facing 247. *Mod. Review*, 1924, October, p. 431; *IHQ*, 1929, 602f.; *Ep. Ind.* XX. 54ff). It is interesting to note that the title, '*Senāpati*' clung to the *deva* (king) Pushyamitra even after the performance of the *Aśvamedha*. *Cf.* the epithet *Vāhinīpati* applied to king Virāṭa in the *Mahābhārata* and the title *Yavuga* applied to Kushān emperors besides other epithets. *Cf.* also the style *Mahārāja Mahāsenāpati* in CII, Vol 3, p. 252, and the title *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* applied to Bijjala and others even after the assumption of the full royal style (*Bomb. Gaz.*, II. ii. 474ff).

[3] Act I. Some manuscripts mention Mandākinī as the name of the river (*cf. IHQ*, 1925, 214). A stream called Mandākinī lies 5 miles south of the Tāptī (*Ind. Ant.*, 1902, 254). Another Mandākinī flowed near Chitrakūṭa (*Rām.* 92. 10-11). Lüders' Inscriptions, Nos. 687-688, seem to suggest that Bharhut (in Baghelkhand) was governed by a Śuṅga feudatory. If Pushyamitra was a Śuṅga Baghelkhand must have formed part of the empire of his family. In the *Monuments of Sāñchī*, I, iv. 271, the author does not agree with Bühler in assigning the ins. to the middle of the second century B.C. A Suṅgarāja (Agarāja?) is known from certain coins found at Kauśāmbi (*JNSI*, IV, 1, 14). His identity is, however, uncertain He prefers B.C. 100-75. Palaeographically the epigraphs are classed with the ins. of Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra and Vishṇumitra.

(established not long ago) and compares its king to a tree which is newly planted and, therefore, not firm (*navasaṁropana-śithilastaruḥ*). The king of Vidarbha is represented as a relation (sister's husband) of the Maurya minister (*Sachiva*) and a natural enemy (*Prakṛityamitra*) of the family of Pushyamitra. It appears that during the reign of Bṛihadratha Maurya there were two parties or factions in the Magadha Empire, one headed by the king's *Sachiva* or minister, the other headed by his *Senāpati* or general. The minister's partisan Yajñasena got the rulership of Vidarbha, while the general's son Agnimitra obtained the viceroyalty of Vidiśā. When the general organised his *coup d'etat,* killed the king, and imprisoned the minister, Yajñasena apparently declared his independence and commenced hostilities against the usurping family. This is why he is called *achirādhishṭhitarājya* and *prakṛity-amitra* by Agnimitra and his *Amātya.*

The *Mālavikāgnimitram* says that when *Kumāra* Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñasena and a partisan of Agnimitra, was secretly on his way to Vidiśā, he was captured by an *Antapāla* (Warden of the Marches) of Yajñasena and kept in custody. Agnimitra demanded his surrender. The Vidarbha king promised to give him up on condition that his brother-in-law, the Maurya minister, should be released. This enraged the ruler of Vidiśā who ordered Vīrasena to march against Vidarbha. Yajñasena was defeated. Mādhavasena was released and the kingdom of Vidarbha was divided between the two cousins, the river Varadā (Wardha) forming the boundary between the two states. Both the rulers seem to have accepted the suzerainty of the House of Pushyamitra.

In the opinion of several scholars an enemy more formidable than Yajñasena threatened Pushyamitra's dominions from Kaliṅga (Orissa). In his *Oxford History of India*[1] Dr. Smith accepts the view that **Khāravela, king**

[1] Additions and corrections, and p. 58n. *Cf.* also S. Konow in *Acta Orientalia*, I. 29. S. Konow accepts Jayaswal's identification, Bahasatimita = Pushyamitra.

of Kalinga, defeated Pushyamitra who is identified with Bahapatimita or Bahasatimita, a prince supposed to be mentioned in the *Hāthīgumphā* Inscription of the Kalinga monarch. Prof. Dubreuil also seems to endorse the view that Khāravela was an antagonist of Pushyamitra, and that the Hāthīgumphā Inscription is dated the 165th year of *Rāja-Muriya-kāla* (era of king Maurya) which corresponds to the 13th year of the reign of Khāravela.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar, however, points out[1] that of the six letters of the Hāthīgumphā Inscription which have been read as *Bahasati-mitam,* the second letter seems to have a clear *u* sign attached to it, and the third and fourth letters look like *pa* and *sa.* Even if the reading *Bahasati-mitam,* or *Bahapati-mitam,* be accepted as correct, the identification of Bahasati (Bṛihaspati-mitra) with Pushyamitra merely on the ground that Bṛihaspati (Jīva) is the regent, *nakshatrādhipa,* of the *nakshatra* or zodiacal asterism Pushya, also named Tishya, in the constellation Cancer or the Crab, cannot be regarded as final in the absence of more convincing evidence.[2] In this connection we should note that the *Divyāvadāna*[3] distinguishes between a king named "Vṛihaspati" and king Pushyamitra,[4] and represents Pāṭaliputra as the residence of the latter whereas the Magadhan antagonist of Khāravela is possibly called "*Rājagahanapa*"[5] and apparently resided in the city of Rājagṛiha.

The date "165th year of the *Muriyakāla*" was deduced from a passage of the Hāthīgumphā Inscription which was

[1] *Ind. Ant.,* 1919, p. 189. *Cf.* Allan *CICAI,* p. xcviii.

[2] *Cf.* Chandra in *IHQ,* 1929, pp. 594ff.

[3] Pp. 433-34.

[4] It is not suggested that Vṛihaspati of the *Divyāvadāna* is necessarily to be identified with any king named Bṛihaspatimitra mentioned in inscriptions, though the possibility is not entirely excluded. What we mean to point out is that the name "Bṛihaspati" is not to be equated with Pushyamitra, simply because Bṛihaspati is the "regent" of the asterism *Pushya,* because in literature 'Vṛihaspati,' 'Pushyadharman' and 'Pushyamitra' occur as names of *distinct* individuals. Regarding the proposed identification of Pushyamitra with Bṛihaspatimitra, see also *IHQ,* 1930, p. 23.

[5] *Cf.* Lüders' reading, *Ep. Ind.,* X, App. No. 1345. With Jayaswal, S. Konow (*Acta Orientalia,* I. 26) reads "*Rājagaham upapīḍāpayati,*" though he admits that "*Rājagahanapa* (*ṃ*) *pīḍāpayati*" is also possible.

read as follows:[1]—"*Pānaṁtariya-saṭhi-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kāle vochchhine...*". There is another passage in the same inscription which runs thus:—*Paṁchame cha* (or *che*) *dānī vase Naṁda-rāja ti-vasa-sata* (*m* ?)—*oghāṭitaṁ Tanasuliya-vāṭā-panāḍiṁ nagaraṁ pavesayati.*[2] If *Pānaṁtariya-saṭhi-vasa-sate* be taken to mean "in the 165th year", *ti-vasa-sata* should be taken to mean 103 years, and we shall have to conclude that Khāravela flourished some 165 years after a Maurya king, and only 103 years after Nandarāja, which is impossible as the Nandas preceded the Mauryas. If, on the other hand, *ti-vasa-sata* be taken to mean 300 years, *pānaṁtariya-saṭhi-vasa-sata* should be taken to mean not 165 but 6,500 years. In other words Khāravela will have to be placed 6,500 years after a Maurya which is also impossible. Jayaswal himself subsequently gave up the reading "... *Pānaṁtariya-saṭhi-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kāle vochchhine cha chhe-yaṭhi Argasi ti kaṁtāriyaṁ upādiyati*" in line 16, and proposed to read "*Paṭāliko chatare cha veduriyagabhe thaṁbhe patiṭhāpayati pānatariyā sata-sahasehi. Muriya kālaṁ vochhiṁnaṁ cha choyaṭhi agasatikaṁtariyaṁ upādāyati.*" He translated the passage thus:—"on the lower-roofed terrace (*i.e.*, in the *verandah*) he establishes columns inlaid with beryl at the cost of 75,00,000 (*Paṇas*), he (the king) completes the Muriya time (era), counted and being of an interval of 64 with a century."[3] With regard to this new reading and translation Mr. R. P. Chanda observed[4] "the rendering of *vochhine* as 'counted' is even more far-

[1] *Cf.* Bhagwanlal Indraji, *Actes du sixiéme congrés international des Orientalistes.* Pt III, Section 2, pp. 133ff.; Jayaswal, *JBORS*, 1917, p. 459.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 455. For the interpretation of the passage, see p. 229 *supra*. S. Konow translates it differently:—"And now in the fifth year he has the aqueduct which was shut (or opened) in the year 103 (during the reign of) the Nanda king, conducted into the town from Tanasuliya Vāṭa."

[3] *JBORS*, Vol. IV, Part iv, p. 394f. For Dr. Barua's suggestions, see *IHQ*, 1938, 269.

[4] *MASI*, No. 1. p. 10. *Cf.* also S. Konow in *Acta Orientalia*, I. 14-21. Like Fleet S. Konow finds no date in the passage but regards the reading *Rāja Muriya kāla* as certain. According to him Khāravela restored some texts missing in the time of the Maurya king Chandragupta. Dr. Barua does not regard the reading Muriya as certain.

fetched than 'expired'. The particle *cha* after *vochhine* makes it difficult to read it as *vochhinam* qualifying the substantive *Muriyakālam*. Even if we overlook *vochhine*, the passage appears to be a very unusual way of stating a date. Still more unusual is the statement of a date as an independent achievement in a *praśasti*." According to Fleet the use of the term "*vochchhina*" which is applied to sacred texts which have been 'cut off', 'interrupted'—quite prohibits the existence of a date. It may be added that there is no reliable evidence of the existence of a *Rāja-Muriya-kāla* in the sense of an era founded by the first Maurya. The use of regnal years by Aśoka points to the same conclusion.[1] Jayaswal himself admits in the *Epigraphia Indica*,[2] that "there is no date in a Maurya era in the 16th line," of the Hāthīgumphā inscription.[3]

Dr. Jayaswal at one time took *ti-vasa-sata* to mean 300 years and placed Khāravela and Pushyamitra three centuries after Nandarāja whom he identified with Nandavardhana. But we have already seen that Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana was a Śaiśunāga king and that the Śaiśunāgas do not appear to have had anything to do with Kaliṅga. "It

[1] An era of Samprati, grandson of Aśoka, is, however, mentioned in an ancient Jain MS. (*EHI*, 4, p. 202n). If we refer the year 164 to this era, the date of Khāravela must be brought down to (*cir.* 224—164=) 60 B.C. In "*A note on the Hāthīgumphā Inscription of Khāravela*" Barnett suggests the following rendering of the passage which is supposed to contain the words *Muriya-kāla*· "And when the Mauryan (?) time-reckoning . . . . . which consisted of lustres (*antara*) of five (years) each, had broken down, he found (a new time-reckoning) consisting of lustres of 7 years each (*saptikāntariyam*) and mounting up to the 64th year (*chatuḥ shashṭyagram*)." To reform the calendar Khāravela introduced a new cycle of 64 years consisting of 9 *Yugas* of 7 years each. According to Dr. F. W Thomas (*JRAS*, 1922, 84) *antara*= *antargriha*=cell. The passage means that cells which had been left unfinished during the time of the Maurya kings were constructed by Khāravela.

[2] XX. 74.

[3] His latest reading of the inscriptional passage is as follows:—
"*Paṭalako chaturo cha veḍūriya-gabhe thaṁbhe patiṭhāpayati, pānātarīya satasahase(hi); Muriya-kāla-vochhinaṁ cha choyaṭh(i) Aṁga satika(ṁ) turiyaṁ upādayati.*"

"Paṭalaka(?) . . . . . (he) sets up four columns inlaid with beryl at the cost of seventy-five hundred thousands; . . . . (he) causes to be compiled expeditiously the (text) of the sevenfold *Aṁgas* of the sixty-four (letters)." *Ep. Ind.*, XX, pp. 80, 89.

is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought 'all under his sole sway' and 'uprooted all Kshatriyas' or the old reigning families. So we should identify '*Naṁdarāja*' of the Hāthīgumphā inscription, who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons."[1] Professor Barua objects to the identification of "*Naṁdarāja*," the conqueror of Kaliṅga, with a king of the pre-Aśokan Nanda line on the ground that in the Aśokan inscriptions it is claimed that Kaliṅga was *not* conquered (*avijita*) before Aśoka. But such claims are on a par with the Gupta boast that Samudra Gupta was *ajita-rājajetā*, conqueror of unconquered kings,[2] and that the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice had been revived, after a long period of abeyance, by him. We know that as a matter of fact the claims, if taken too literally, had very little substance in them. The suggestion in the *Cambridge History of Ancient India* that Nandarāja may have been a local ruler of Kaliṅga is negatived by the internal evidence of the Hāthīgumphā Inscription.[3] A post-Aśokan "neo-Nanda" line of **Magadha** is also unknown to sober history.[4]

As Mahāpadma Nanda and his sons ruled in the fourth century B.C., Khāravela is to be assigned either to the third century B.C., (taking *ti-vasa-sata* to mean 103)[5] or to the first century B.C. (taking *ti-vasa-sata* to mean

[1] *MASI*, No. I, p. 12.

[2] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, p. cx. *Cf*. Jahāngir's boast that "not one of the mighty emperors has conquered" Kangra (*ASI*, *AR*, 1905-6, p. 11). *Avijita* may simply refer to the fact that Kaliṅga was not included within the limits of Aśoka's *Vijita* (empire) or *Rāja-vishya* (Royal Dominions).

[3] *Cf*. the passage—"*Naṁdarāja nītaṁ cha Kaliṁga Jinasaṁnivesam*" which proves clearly that Nanda was an outsider.

[4] A late Nanda or *Nandodbhava* line is known to epigraphy. But it ruled in Orissa. See R. D. Banerji. Orissa, I. 202; Kumar Bidyādhara Singh Deo, *Nandapur*, I. 46; Ep. Ind. xxi, App. Ins. No. 2043.

[5] Konow (*Acta Orientalia*, Vol. I, pp. 22-26) accepts the date 103, but refers it (along with another date, 113, which he, with Fleet, finds in line 11) to a Jaina era. This era he is inclined to identify with that of Mahāvīra's *Nirvāṇa*. Apparently he is not aware of the existence of another Jaina reckoning, *viz*., the era of Samprati. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal (*Ep. Ind*., XX. 75) now assigns the date 103 to a Nanda era and says that the date refers to the time when the Tanasuliya Canal, which Khāravela extended to the capital in the 5th year of his reign, was originally excavated.

300). In neither case could he be regarded as a contemporary of Pushyamitra who ruled from about 187 to 151 B.C.

The Yavana Invasion

The only undoubted historical events of Pushyamitra's time, besides the *coup d' etat* of *c.* 187 B.C., and the Vidarbha war, are the Greek invasion from the North-West referred to by Patañjali or a predecessor and Kālidāsa, and the celebration of two horse-sacrifices.

Patañjali is usually regarded as a contemporary of Pushyamitra. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar draws our attention to the passage in the *Mahābhāshya—iha Pushyamitraṁ yājayāmaḥ*: "here we perform the sacrifices for Pushyamitra"—which is cited as an illustration of the *Vārttika* teaching the use of the present tense to denote an action which has been begun but not finished.[1] The instances given by Patañjali of the use of the imperfect to indicate an action well-known to people, but not witnessed by the speaker, and still possible to have been seen by him, are, "*arunad Yavanaḥ Sāketam*: *arunad Yavano Madhyamikām.*" This, says Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, shows that a certain *Yavana* or Greek chief had besieged Sāketa or Ayodhyā and another place called Madhyamikā[2] when Patañjali wrote this. It is, however, possible that the instances cited by the great grammarian are stock illustrations (*mūrdhābhishikta udāharaṇa*) which are simply quoted by him from earlier authorities. But a war with Greeks in the days of Pushyamitra is vouched for by Kālidāsa. In his *Mālavikāgnimitram* the poet refers to a conflict between prince Vasumitra, grandson and general of Pushyamitra, and a Yavana on the southern (or right) bank of the Sindhu.[3] Unfortunately the name of the

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1872, p. 300.

[2] Nāgari near Chitor; *cf. Mbh.*, II. 32.8; *Ind. Ant.*, VII, 267.

[3] The Indus or possibly a stream of the same name in Central India (*Cf. IHQ*, 1925, 215).

leader of the invaders is not given either in the *Mahābhāshya* or in the *Mālavikāgnimitram*. There is considerable divergence of opinion with regard to his identity. But all agree that he was a Bactrian Greek.

The **Bactrian Greeks** were originally subjects of the Seleukidan Empire of Syria (and Western Asia). We learn from Strabo, Trogus and Justin that "about the middle of the third century B.C. when the Seleukid rulers were pre-occupied in the west" Diodotos, "Governor of the thousand cities of Bactria" (Balkh region to the south of the Oxus), revolted and assumed the title of king. He was succeeded, according to Justin, by his son Diodotos II who entered into an alliance with Arsakes who about this time (*c.* 247 B.C.) tore Parthia in Northern Irān from the Seleukidan Empire.

The successor of Diodotos II was Euthydemos. We learn from Strabo[1] that Euthydemos and his party occasioned the revolt of all the country near the province of Bactriana. We are told by Polybius that Antiochos III (223-187 B.C.) of Syria made an attempt to recover the lost provinces but afterwards made peace with Euthydemos. The historian says, "Antiochos the Great received the young prince (Demetrios, son of Euthydemos) and judging from his appearance, conversation and the dignity of his manners that he was worthy of royal honour he first promised to give him one of his daughters,[2] and secondly conceded the royal title to his father. And having on the other points caused a written treaty to be drawn up and the terms of the treaty to be confirmed on oath, he marched away, after liberally provisioning his troops, and accepting the elephants belonging to Euthydemos. He crossed Caucasus (Hindukush) and descended into India; renewed his friendship with Sophagasenos, the king of the

[1] H. & F.'s Tr., Vol. II, p. 251.

[2] Tarn's scepticism (*Greeks in Bactria and India*, 82, 201) about the marriage is not warranted by cogent evidence. His arguments are in part of a negative character. He seems to prefer his own interpretation of certain coins of Agathokles to the clear testimony of Polybius.

Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, having once more provisioned his troops set out again personally with his army, leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him."

Not long after the expedition of Antiochos the Great, the Bactrian Greeks themselves formed the design of extending their kingdom by the conquest of the territories lying to the south of the Hindukush. Strabo says, "the Greeks who occasioned its (Bactria's) revolt became so powerful that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodoros of Artemita.[1] Their chiefs, particularly Menander (if he really crossed the Hypanis[2] to the east and reached the Isamus[3]) conquered more nations than Alexander. These conquests were achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, king of the Bactrians. They got possession not only of Patalene (the Indus Delta), but of the kingdoms of Saraostos (Surāshṭra or Kāṭhiāwār), and Sigerdis (probably Sāgaradvîpa)[4] which constitute the remainder of the coast. Apollodoros in short says that Bactriana is the ornament of all Ariana. They extended their empire even as far as the Seres and Phryni."[5]

Strabo gives the credit for spreading the Greek dominion furthest to the east into India partly to Menander and partly to Demetrios, son of Euthydemos and son-in-law of Antiochos the Great.

Menander has been identified with the king Milinda who is mentioned in the *Milinda-pañho* as a contemporary of the Buddhist *Thera* (Elder) Nāgasena, and also in the

[1] Artemita lay to the east of the Tigris. The books of Apollodoros are assigned to a date between *c.* 130 B.C. and 87 B.C. (Tarn, Greeks, 44ff)

[2] *I.e.*, the Hyphasis or Vipāśā (the Beas).

[3] The Trisāmā? In the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (V. 19. 17) a river of this name is mentioned in conjunction with the Kauśikī, Mandākinī, Yamunā, etc. Sircar prefers the Ikshumatī.

[4] *Mbh*, II. 31. 66, Cutch? *Bom Gaz*, I. i. 16f.; *cf*. Tarn, *GBI*, 2nd ed. 527.

[5] *Strabo*, Hamilton and Falconer, Vol. II, pp. 252-53. The Chinese and peoples of the Tarim basin are apparently meant.

Avadāna-kalpalatā of Kshemendra.[1] This monarch was born at Kalsigrāma[2] in the "Island" of Alasanda or Alexandria[3] and had his capital at Sāgala or Śākala, modern Śiālkot, in the Pañjāb,[4] and not at Kābul as Dr. Smith seemed to think.[5] The extent of his conquests is indicated by the great variety and wide diffusion of his coins which have been found over a very wide extent of country as far west as Begram near Kābul and as far east as Mathurā.[6] The author of the *Periplus* states that small silver coins, inscribed with Greek characters and bearing the name of Menander[7] were still current in his time (*c.* 60-80 A.D.) at the port of Barygaza (Broach). Plutarch tells us that Menander was noted for justice, and enjoyed such popularity with his subjects that upon his death, which took place in camp, diverse cities contended for the possession of his ashes. The statement of Plutarch is important as showing that Menander's dominions included many cities. The recently discovered Bajaur Relic Casket Inscription confirms the numismatic evidence regarding the westward extension of his empire.[8]

Demetrios has been identified by some with king Dattāmitra mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*,[9] the "great Emetreus, the king of Inde" of Chaucer's *Knightes Tale* and Timitra of a Besnagar seal.[10] The wide extent of his conquests is proved by the existence of several cities named after him or his father in Afghanistān as well as

[1] *Stūpa avadāna* (No. 57); Smith, *Catalogue of Coins, Indian Museum*, p 3; *SBE*, 36, xvii.

[2] Trenckner, *Milindapañho*, p. 83.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 82 (*CHI*, 550). The identity of this "Alexandria" is uncertain. Tarn (p. 141) seems to prefer Alexandria in the Kābul Valley. The *Milinda*, VI. 21, seems to suggest location on the sea unless a different Alexandria is meant.

[4] *Milinda*, pp. 3, 14.

[5] *EHI*, 1914, p. 225.

[6] *SBE*, Vol XXXV, p. xx. Tarn, 228.

[7] For Coins of Apollodotos and Menander in Gujrat, see *Bomb. Gaz.*, I i pp. 16-17; *Num. Chr. JRNS* (1950), 207.

[8] *Ep. Ind.* XXIV. 7ff. XXVI, 318f, XXVII, ii. 52f. The King's name is given as Mina-edra.

[9] I. 139, 23. Krimisa, the Yaksha (*AIU*, p. 107) with whom he is identified by Dr. Bagchi belongs to the domain of folklore.

[10] *EHI*, 1914, p. 255n.

India. Thus in the work of Isidore of Charax[1] we have a reference to a city named Demetriaspolis in Arachosia. The *Vyākaraṇa* (grammar) of Kramadîśvara mentions a city in Sauvîra called Dāttāmitrî.[2] Ptolemy the Geographer mentions the city of Euthymedia (? Euthydemia[3]) which was identical with Śākala,[4] and was, according to the *Milinda-pañho*, the capital of an Indo-Greek kingdom in the time of Menander.

It is permissible to conjecture that one of the two conquering kings, *viz.*, Menander and Demetrios, was identical with the Yavana leader who penetrated to Sāketa in Oudh, Madhyamikā near Chitor, and the river Sindhu possibly in Central India, in the time of Pushyamitra. Goldstücker, Smith and many other scholars identified the invader with Menander who crossed the Hypanis (Beas) and penetrated *as far as* the Isamus (Trisāmā[5]?). On the other hand, Dr. Bhandarkar suggested, in his *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*, the identification of the invader with Demetrios. We learn from Polybius that Demetrios was a young man at the time of Antiochos III's invasion (between 211 and 206 B.C.) Justin says that Demetrios was

[1] *JRAS*, 1915, p. 830. *Parthian Stations*, 19.

[2] *Ind. Ant.*, 1911 *Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*, *Bomb. Gaz.*, I. ii. 11, 176, Kramadīśvara, p. 796. The reference is probably to a Demetrias in the lower Indus Valley. Johnston differs from the view (*JRAS*, April, 1939; *IHQ*, 1939). We should, however, not ignore the evidence of *Mbh.* I. 139, verses 21-23, which clearly refer to a *Yavanādhipa* and Dattāmitra in connection with Sauvīra. If Dattāmitra is not Demetrios and Dāttāmitrī not a city founded by him, it will be interesting to know with whom Dattāmitra and the *Yavanādhipa* of the epic are proposed to be identified. A Nāsik (Deccan) Inscription (No. 1140 Lüders' List) makes mention of a Yoṇaka from the north (*Otarāha*), a native of Dāttāmitrī. Thus epic and epigraphic evidence together with that of Sanskrit grammarians clearly establishes the connection between the Yonas or Yavanas (Greeks), Dāttāmitrī and Sauvīra.

[3] We are hardly justified in rejecting the reading '*Euthyde*' (Tarn, p. 486) simply on the grounds urged by Tarn (p. 247) which do not appear to be convincing, and accept a reading which is "meaningless and wrongly accentuated". See also Keith in *D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, 221f.

[4] *Ind. Ant*, 1884, pp. 349-50.

[5] As already stated, Trisāmā is a river mentioned in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Note the absence of any reference to the Ganges in Strabo's account of Menander's conquests.

"king of the Indians" when Eukratides was the king of the Bactrians and Mithradates was the king of the Parthians. "Almost at the same time that Mithradates ascended the throne among the Parthians, **Eukratides** began to reign among the Bactrians; both of them being great men... Eukratides carried on several wars with great spirit, and though much reduced by his losses in them, yet, when he was besieged by Demetrios, king of the Indians, with a garrison of only 300 soldiers, he repulsed, by continual sallies, a force of 60,000 enemies." Dr. Smith assigns Mithradates to the period from 171 to 136 B.C. (to 138/37 B.C. according to Debevoise). Eukratides and Demetrios must also be assigned to that period, that is the middle of the second century B.C.[1]

We have seen that Demetrios was a young man and a prince in or about 206 B.C. We now find that he ruled as king of the Indians about the middle of the second century B.C. He was, therefore, the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra who ruled from *c.* 187 to 151 B.C. Menander, on the other hand, must have ruled over the Indo-Greek kingdom much later, as will be apparent from the facts noted below. Justin tells us that Demetrios was deprived of his Indian possessions by Eukratides.[2] Eukratides was killed by his son with whom he had shared his throne.[3] The identity of the parricide is uncertain but no one says that he was Menander.[4]

[1] The activity of Mithradates I began after the death of Antiochos IV in 163 B.C. See Tarn, pp. 197ff. According to Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, p. 20ff. Antiochos IV, Epiphanes, crossed the Euphrates in 165 B.C. Mithradates I died in 138/37 B.C., the first Parthian date fixed by numismatic and cuneiform evidence. Eukratides assumed the title "Great" before 162 B.C. (date of Timarchus) (*The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, p. 64). His coins are copied by Plato (165 B.C.) as well as Timarchus.

[2] Watson's tr., p. 277.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[4] According to Cunningham and Smith the parricide was Apollodotos. But Rapson shows good reasons for believing that Appollodotos did not belong to the family of Eukratides, but was, on the other hand, a ruler of Kāpiśa who was ousted by Eukratides (*JRAS*, 1905, pp. 784-85). Rawlinson points out (*Intercourse between India and the Western World*, p. 73) that Appollodotos uses the epithet Philopator, and the title would be somewhat incon-

Justin furnishes the important information that the prince who murdered Eukratides was a colleague of his father. We know that Greek rulers who reigned conjointly sometimes issued joint coins. Thus we have joint coins of Lysias and Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato, of Strato I and Strato II, and of Hermaios and Kalliope. The only Greeks whose names and portraits appear on a coin or medallion together with those of Eukratides are **Heliokles** and his wife Laodike. Cunningham and Gardner suggested that Heliokles and Laodike were the father and mother of Eukratides. But Von Sallet[1] proposed an entirely different interpretation of the coins in question. He thought that they were issued by Eukratides, not in honour of his parents, but on the occasion of the marriage of his son Heliokles with a Laodike whom Von Sallet conjectured to have been daughter of Demetrios by the daughter of Antiochos III. If Von Sallet's conjecture be accepted then it is permissible to think that Heliokles was the colleague of Eukratides referred to by Justin, and the murderer of his father.

It is clear from what has been stated above that Demetrios was succeeded by Eukratides, who, in his turn, was probably followed by Heliokles. Menander could not in that case have reigned earlier than Heliokles. It may, however, be argued that after Demetrios the Indo-Greek kingdom split up into two parts: one part which included the Trans-Jhelum territories was ruled by Eukratides and his son, the other part which included "Euthymedia" (Euthydemia?) or Śākala was ruled by Menander who thus might have been a younger contemporary of Eukratides (*c.* 171-165 B.C.) and consequently of Pushyamitra (*c.* 187-151 B.C.).

Now, the disruption of the Indo-Greek kingdom after

gruous if he were a parricide. It may be argued that the parricide was Apollodotos Soter and not Apollodotos Philopator, but we should remember that the titles Soter and Philopator sometimes occur on the same coin (Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins*, p. 48) and therefore it is impossible to justify the separation of Apollodotos Soter and Apollodotos Philopator as two entities.

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1880, p. 256.

Demetrios may be accepted as an historical fact. The existence of two rival Greek kingdoms in India and their mutual dissensions are proved by literary and numismatic evidence. The *Purāṇas* say:

Bhavishyantīha Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato'rthataḥ
naiva Mūrdhābhishiktās te bhavishyanti narādihpāḥ
yuga-dosha-durāchārā bhavishyanti nṛpās tu te
strīnām bāla-vadhenaiva hatvā chaiva parasparam.

"There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious feeling or ambition or plunder; they will not be kings solemnly anointed but will follow evil customs by reason of the corruptions of the age. Massacring women and children[1] and *killing one another*, kings will enjoy the earth at the end of the *Kali* age."[2]

The *Gārgī Saṃhitā* informs us:

Madhyadeśe na sthāsyanti Yanvanā yuddha durmadāḥ
teshām anyonya saṃbhāvā (?) *bhavishyanti na saṁśayaḥ*
ātma-chakrotthitaṃ ghoram yuddhaṁ parama-dāruṇam.

"The fiercely fighting Greeks will not stay in the *Madhyadeśa* (Mid-India); there will be a cruel, dreadful war in their own kingdom, caused between themselves."[3]

Coins bear testimony to struggles between kings of the **house of Eukratides** and rulers of the **family of Euthydemos.** But the evidence which we possess clearly indicates that the contemporaries and rivals of Eukratides and Heliokles were **Apollodotos, Agathokleia** and **Strato I,** and not Menander. A square copper[4] coin of Eukratides has on the obverse a bust of the king and the legend "*Basileus Megalou Eukratidou*". On the reverse there is the figure of Zeus and the legend "*Kavisiye nagaradevatā.*" They are often coins (?) of Apollodotos restruck.[5] From

[1] *Cf.* Cunn. *AGI*, Revised Ed. 274; *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, I. 376. "The Macedonians . . . . gave away to a fury of blood-lust, sparing neither woman nor child."

[2] Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 56, 74.

[3] Kern, *Bṛihat Saṃhitā*, p. 38.

[4] *CHI*, 555, 690; Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 26.

[5] Rapson, JRAS, 1905, p 785. According to some 'overstriking in itself is no evidence of conquest' but simply of commercial relationship (*JAOS*, 1950, p. 210).

this it is probable that Apollodotos was a rival of Eukratides, and was superseded in the rule of Kāpiśa, which lay in the district identified with Kāfiristān and the valleys of Ghorband and Panjshir, by the latter. Rapson further points out[1] that Heliokles restruck the coins of Agathokleia and Strato I ruling conjointly and also of Strato I reigning alone. Further, the restriking is always by Heliokles, never by Agathokleia and Strato I. From this it is clear that Agathokleia and Strato I ruled over an Indo-Greek principality either before, or in the time of Heliokles, but probably not after him.

We have seen that according to the evidence of Justin and the Kāpiśa coins Eukratides probably fought against two rivals, namely, Demetrios and Apollodotos; his son Heliokles also fought against two rivals, namely, Agathokleia and Strato I. Seltman (*Greek Coins* 235) refers to a large gold coin which Eukratides struck to mark his triumph over Demetrios. Some distinguish between a Bactrian and an Indo-Bactrian Heliokles (*JRNS*, 1950, 211-12). The duplication of the *Indian Heliokles* requires cogent proof As Demetrios and Apollodotos were both antagonists of Eukratides and used similar coin-types, the inevitable inference is that they were very near in time as well as in relationship to one another, in fact that one immediately followed the other. Now Demetrios was beyond doubt the son and successor of Euthydemos, consequently Apollodotos must have been his successor.

As Heliokles was in all probability a son of Eukratides, the rival of Apollodotos, he must have been a younger contemporary of Apollodotos. Consequently, Heliokles' antagonists, Agathokleia and Strato I, whose coins he restruck, were very near in time to Apollodotos. Strato I later on ruled conjointly with his grandson Strato II. There is no room for the long and prosperous reign of Menander in the period which elapsed from Demetrios to Strato II. According to the Buddhist tradition recorded in the

[1] *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 165ff. *CHI*, p. 553.

Milinda-pañho, Milinda or Menander flourished "500 years," *i.e.,* not earlier than the fifth century[1] after the *Parinirvāṇa, parinibbānato pañchavassa sate atikkante ete upajjissanti.*[2] This tradition points to a date not earlier than the period 144-44 B.C. according to Ceylonese reckoning, *or* 86 B.C.-14 A.D. according to Cantonese tradition, for Menander. Thus both according to numismatic evidence and literary tradition Menander could not have been the Indo-Greek contemporary of Pushyamitra.[3] It is Demetrios who should, therefore, be identified with the Yavana invader referred to by Patañjali and Kālidāsa, one of whose armies was defeated by Prince Vasumitra[4].

The Aśvamedha Sacrifices

After the victorious wars with Vidarbha (Berar) and the Yavanas Pushyamitra completed the performance of two horse-sacrifices. These sacrifices are regarded by some scholars as marking an early stage in the Brāhmaṇical reaction which was fully developed five centuries later in the time of Samudra Gupta and his successors. Buddhist writers are alleged to represent Pushyamitra as a cruel persecutor of the religion of Śākyamuni. But the proba-

[1] *Cf.* the interpretation of somewhat similar chronological data by Franke and Fleet (*JRAS*, 1914, pp. 400-1); and Smith *EHI*, 3rd Edition, p 328.

[2] Trenckner, the *Milinda-pañho*, p. 3. Tarn is not quite right in saying (134n) that Apollodoros makes Menander contemporary with Demetrios, Trogus with Apollodotos, and some coin indications (*CHI*, p 551) with Eukratides. Strabo following Apollodoros and possibly other authorities simply says that extensive Bactrian conquests in the Indian interior were achieved *partly* by Menander and *partly* by Demetrios. It is nowhere *clearly* stated that the two conquerors were contemporaries. The book of Trogus on which another conclusion is based, is lost. Coin indications are not clear enough. *E.g.*, the imitation of certain coins of Demetrios by Maues does not prove chronological proximity.

[3] *Cf.* 445n *infra.*

[4] S. Konow (*Acta Orientalia*, 1. 35) points out that there is *no evidence that Menander transgressed the river Yamunā*, and that Demetrios was the ruler who besieged Sāketa and Madhyamikā. In *IHQ*, 1929, p. 403, Mr. R. P. Chanda regards Strabo's attribution of the Indian conquests to Demetrios as doubtful. But the cities in the Pañjāb and the Lower Indus Valley, named after Demetrios and possibly his father, leave no room for doubt that Strabo is right.

tive value of the *Divyāvadāna*, on which some modern writers place their chief reliance in regard to the matter, is seriously impaired by the representation of the "persecuting" monarch as a Maurya, a descendant of Aśoka himself.[1] Moreover, the prime motive which is said to have inclined the king to a vicious policy is, according to this Buddhist work, *personal glory* and *not religious fanaticism*. Pushyamitra did not dispense with the services of pro-Buddhist ministers, and the court of his son was graced by Paṇḍita-Kauśiki.[2] The *Mahāvaṁsa*[3] admits the presence, in Bihar, Oudh, Mālwa and adjacent provinces, of numerous monasteries with thousands of monks in the age of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi of Ceylon (*c.* 101-77 B.C.) which is partly synchronous with the Baimbika-Śuṅga period. The Buddhist monuments at Bhārhut erected "during the sovereignty of the Śuṅgas" do not also bear out the theory that the Śuṅgas, among whom Pushyamitra is included by the *Purāṇas*, were the leaders of a militant Brāhmaṇism. Though staunch adherents of orthodox Hinduism, kings of the line of Pushyamitra do not appear to have been as intolerant as some writers represent them to be.

The Mantri-parishad in the days of Pushyamitra

Patañjali refers to the *Sabhā* of Pushyamitra. But it is uncertain as to whether the term refers to a Royal *Durbar*, a tribunal of justice, or a Council of Magnates. The existence of Councils or Assemblies of Ministers (*Mantri-parishad*) is, however, vouched for by Kālidāsa. If the poet is to be believed the Council continued to be an important element of the governmental machinery. He gives us the valuable information that even viceregal princes were assisted by *Parishads*.[4] *The Mālavikāgnimit-*

[1] *IHQ*, Vol. V, p. 397; *Divyāvadāna*, 433-34.
[2] *Mālavikāgnimitram*, Act I.
[3] Geiger, trans., p. 193.
[4] Bühler (*Ep. Ind.* III. 137) points out that Aśoka's *Kumāras* were also each assisted by a body of *Mahāmātras*. These may have corresponded to the *Kumārāmātyas* of the Gupta period.

ram refers in clear terms to the dealings of Prince Agnimitra, the Viceroy of Vidiśā (in Eastern Mālwa), with his *Parishad*:

> *"Deva evam Amātya-parishado vijñāpayāmi"*[1]
> *"Mantri-prishado' pyetad-eva darśanam*
> *dvidhā vibhaktāṁ śriyam-udvahantau*
> *dhuraṁ rathāśvāviva saṁgrahītuḥ*
> *tau sthāsyatas-te nṛipater nideśe*
> *paraspar-āvagraha-nirvikārau*[2]
> *Rājā: tena hi Mantri-parishadaṁ brūhi senānye Vīrasenāya likhyatām evaṁ kriyatām iti."*[3]

It seems that the *Amātya-parishad* or *Mantri-parishad* was duly consulted whenever an important matter of foreign policy had to be decided upon.

SECTION II. AGNIMITRA AND HIS SUCCESSORS

Pushyamitra died in or about 151 B.C., probably after a reign of 36 years,[4] and was succeeded by his son **Agnimitra.**[5] The name of a prince named Agnimitra has been found on several copper coins discovered in Rohil-

[1] "King! I will announce this decision to the Council of Ministers."

[2] "This is also the view of the (Council of Ministers). Those two kings, upbearing the fortune of their superior lord divided between them, as the horses upbear the yoke of the charioteer, will remain firm in their allegiance to thee, not being distracted by mutual attacks." Act V, verse 14.

[3] "King: Tell the Council then to send to the General Vīrasena written instructions to this effect." (Tawney, *Mālavikāgnimitra*, pp. 89-90)

[4] Only thirty years according to a Jaina tradition—*"aṭṭhasayaṁ Muriyānaṁ tisa chchia Pūsamittassa"* (IA, 1914, 118 f. Merutuṅga).

[5] The commentary on the *Amarakośa* seems to suggest that Agnimitra is the original of king Śūdraka of tradition (Oka, p. 122; *Ann. Bhand. Or. Res. Inst.*, 1931, 360). On the other hand Keith refers to a tradition recorded in the *Vīra charita* and by the younger Rājaśekhara which represents Śūdraka as a minister of a Sātavāhana king. We are further told by another writer that Śūdraka defeated prince Svāti and ruled for a long time. A tale alluded to in the *Harshacharita* represents him as an enemy of Chandraketu, lord of Chakora, apparently in South India (Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama*, p. 129; *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 292; Ghosh, *History of Central and Western India*, pp. 141 f.). The story of Śūdraka is essentially legendary and it is difficult to extract any historical truth out of it. The abeyance of Sātavāhana power in the Upper Deccan for a long period is a fact. But it is due to the irruption of foreign tribes from the north. Disloyal ministers may have helped to bring in the invader.

khand. Cunningham[1] was of opinion that this prince was probably not to be identified with the son of Pushyamitra, but belonged to a local dynasty of North Pañchāla (Rohilkhand). He gave two reasons for this conclusion:

1. Agnimitra's is the only coin-name found in the Purāṇic lists. The names of the other "Mitra" kings occurring on coins of the so-called "Pañchāla series," do not agree with those found in the *Purāṇas*.

2. The coins are very rarely found beyond the limits of North Pañchāla.

As to the first point Rivett-Carnac[2] and Jayaswal[3] have shown that several coin-names besides that of Agnimitra can be identified with those found in the Purāṇic lists of Śuṅga and Kāṇva kings; for example, Bhadra-ghosha may be identified with Ghosha, the seventh king of the Purāṇic list of Śuṅga kings. Bhūmimitra may be identified with the Kāṇva king of that name. Jethamitra, who is identified with the successor of Agnimitra, *viz.*, Vasu-Jyeshṭha or Su-Jyesṭha, who is called simply **Jyeshṭha** in the *k Vishṇu* manuscript,[4] no doubt left coins that belong to a different series. But even he is closely connected with an Agnimitra. Several names indeed cannot be identified, but they may have been names of those Śuṅgas who survived the usurpation of Vasudeva Kāṇva and the remnant of whose power was destroyed by the so-called Andhras and Śiśunandi.[5]

As to the second point we should remember that "Mitra" coins, even those which undoubtedly belong to the so-called Pañchāla series, have been found in Oudh, the Basti district, and even Pāṭaliputra, as well as in Pañchāla. Names of two "Mitra" kings, Brahmamitra and Indramitra, of whom the latter undoubtedly belonged to the Pañchāla group, are found engraved on two rail pillars

[1] *Coins of Ancient India*, p. 79. *Cf.* Allan, *CICAI*, p. cxx.
[2] *JASB*, 1880, 21ff.; 87ff.; *Ind. Ant.*, 1880, 311.
[3] *JBORS*, 1917, p. 479. *Cf.* 1934, pp. 7ff.
[4] *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 31, n. 12. Pace Allan, *CICAI*, p. xcvi.
[5] *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 49.

at Bodh Gayā as well as on coins discovered at Mathurā, Pañchāla and Kumrahar.[1] In the face of these facts it is difficult to say that the "Mitras" in question were a local dynasty of North Pañchāla. The matter, however, must be regarded as *sub judice*.

Agnimitra's successor, as we have already seen, was Jyeshṭha (of the *k Vishṇu* manuscript), who is very probably identical with **Jeṭhamitra** of the coins.[2]

The next king **Vasumitra** was a son of Agnimitra. During the life-time of his grandfather he had led the imperial army against the Yavanas and defeated them on the Sindhu (possibly in Central India) which probably formed the boundary between the empire of Pushyamitra and the Indo-Greek territories in Malwa.

Vasumitra's successor is called Bhadraka in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, Ārdraka and Odruka in the *Vishṇu*, Āndhraka in the *Vāyu*, and Antaka in the *Matsya Purāṇa*. Jayaswal identified him with Udāka, a name occurring in a Pabhosā inscription. The epigraph has been translated thus: "By Āsāḍhasena, the son of Gopālī Vaihidarī and maternal uncle of king Bahasatimitra, son of Gopālī, a cave was caused to be made in the tenth year of Udāka for the use of the Kassapiya Arhats." We learn from another Pabhosā inscription that Āsāḍhasena belonged to the royal family of Adhichhatrā (Ahichhatrā), the capital of North Pañ-

[1] Cunningham, *Coins of Ancient India*, pp. 84, 88; Allan, *CICAI*, pp. cxix, cxx. Marshall, *Archaeological Survey Report for 1907-8*, p. 40; Bloch, *ASR*, 1908-9, p. 147; *IHQ*, 1930, pp. 1ff. The name *Im . .tra* occurs in a mutilated inscription on a rail pillar at Bodh Gayā with the title *Rāño* added before it. Marshall, Bloch and Rapson agree in identifying king *Im... .tra* with Indramitra of coins. Bloch further identifies him with Kauśikiputra Indrāgnimitra, husband of Āryā Kuraṅgī, whose name occurs on certain pieces of coping. The epithet Kauśikīputra reminds one of Paṇḍita-Kauśikī of the *Mālavikāgnimitram* (Act 1). The Kuśika family was apparently intimately associated with the rulers of the age. Kauśikī mentioned in the *Mālavikāgnimitram* was sister to the minister of a prince of Berar. The sister of the prince herself was one of the queens of Agnimitra. King Brahmamitra is the husband of Nāgadevī, another prominent donor mentioned in the epigraphs.

[2] *Coins of Ancient India*, p. 74. Allan, *CICAI*, xcvi. Note the connection of Jeṭhamitra with Agnimitra. The name of a Jyeshṭhamitra is said to occur also in a Brāhmī inscription on certain stone fragments recently discovered at Kosam (*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, July 11, 1936, p. 5).

chāla. Jayaswal maintained that Odraka (identified with Udāka) was the paramount Śuṅga sovereign, while the family of Āsāḍhasena was either gubernatorial or feudatory to the Magadha throne. Marshall,[1] on the other hand, identified the fifth "Śuṅga" with king Kāsīputra[2] **Bhāgabhadra** mentioned in a Garuḍa Pillar Inscription found in the old city of Vidiśā, now Besnagar. Jayaswal identified Bhāgabhadra with Bhāga Śuṅga, *i.e.*, Bhāgavata of the *Purāṇas*. This theory has to be given up in view of the discovery of another Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar Inscription (of the twelfth year after the installation of Mahārāja **Bhāgavata**) which proves that there was at Vidiśā a king named Bhāgavata apart from king Kāsīputra Bhāgabhadra. In the absence of clear evidence connecting "Udāka" with Vidiśā it cannot be confidently asserted that he belonged to the house of Agnimitra and Bhāgavata. The view of Marshall seems to be more probable.[3]

It appears that the successors of Agnimitra at Vidiśā cultivated friendly relations with the Greek sovereigns of the Western Pañjāb. The policy of the Bactrian Greeks in this respect resembled that of their Seleukidan predecessors. Seleukos, we know, first tried to conquer the Magadha Empire, but, frustrated in his attempts, thought it prudent to make friends with the Mauryas. The Bactrians, too, after the reverses they sustained at the hands of Pushyamitra's general, and weakened moreover by internal dissensions, apparently gave up, for a time at least, their hostile attitude towards the imperial power in the Ganges valley. We learn from the Besnagar Inscription of the reign of Bhāgabhadra that Heliodora (Heliodoros), the son of Diya (Dion), a native of Taxila, came as an ambassador from *Mahārāja* Aṁtalikita (**Antialkidas**) to Rājan Kāsīputra Bhāgabhadra the Saviour (*Trātāra*) who was pros-

[1] *A Guide to Sāñchī*, p. 11 n.

[2] Sircar suggests Kautsīputra.

[3] Dr. Barua points out (*IHQ*, 1930, 23) that "in the absence of the word *rājño* preceding *Udākasa*, it is difficult to say at once whether Udāka is the personal name of a king or the local name of the place where the cave was excavated."

pering in the fourteenth year of his reign. The ambassador, though a Greek, professed the *Bhāgavata* religion and set up a *Garuḍadhvaja* in honour of Vāsudeva (Kṛishṇa), the god of gods. He was apparently well-versed in the *Mahābhārata*[1] which he might have heard recited in his native city of Taxila.

Nothing in particular is known regarding the three immediate successors of Bhadraka. The ninth king Bhāgavata had a long reign which extended over 32 years. Dr. Bhandarkar identifies him with the *Mahārāja* Bhāgavata mentioned in one of the Besnagar Inscriptions referred to above. Bhāgavata's successor **Devabhūti** or Devabhūmi was a young and dissolute prince. The *Purāṇas* state that he was overthrown after a reign of 10 years by his *Amātya* or minister Vasudeva. Bāṇa in his *Harshacharita* says that the over-libidinous Śuṅga was bereft of his life by his *Amātya* Vasudeva with the help of a daughter of Devabhūti's slave woman (*Dāsī*), disguised as his queen. Bāṇa's statement does not necessarily imply that Devabhūti was identical with the murdered Śuṅga. His statement may be construed to mean that Vasudeva entered into a conspiracy with the emissaries of Devabhūti to bring about the downfall of the reigning Śuṅga, (Bhāgavata), and to raise Devabhūti to the throne. But in view of the unanimous testimony of the *Purāṇas* this interpretation of the statement of Bāṇa cannot be upheld.

The Śuṅga power was not altogether extinguished after the tragic end of Devabhūti. It probably survived in Central India[2] till the rise of the so-called Andhras, Andhrabhṛityas or Sātavāhanas who "swept away the remains of the Śuṅga power" and probably appointed

[1] The three immortal precepts, lit. steps to immortality, *dama, chāga* and *apramāda*, self-control, self-denial and watchfulness, mentioned in the second part of Heliodora's inscription, occur in the *Mahābhārata* (V. 43. 22; XI. 7. 23; *Damas-tyāgo' pramādaścha te trayo Brahmaṇo hayāḥ*. *Cf.* also *Gītā*, XVI, 1.2). See *JASB*, 1922, No. 19, pp. 269-271; *ASI*, 1908-1909, p. 126; *JRAS*, 1909, 1055, 1087f, 1093f; 1910, 815; 1914, 1031f; *IHQ*, 1932, 610; *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, 1918-19, p. 59.

[2] Cf. *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 49.

Śiśunandi[1] to govern the Vidiśā region. Śiśunandi's younger brother had a grandson (*dauhitra*) named Śiśuka who became the ruler of Purikā.[2]

SECTION III. IMPORTANCE OF THE BAIMBIKA-ŚUNGA PERIOD OF INDIAN HISTORY

The rule of the emperors of the "house" of Pushyamitra marks an important epoch in the history of India in general and of Central India in particular. The renewed incursions of the Yavanas, which once threatened to submerge the whole of the *Madhyadeśa,* received a check, and the Greek dynasts of the borderland reverted to the prudent policy of their Seleukidan precursors. There was an outburst of activity in the domains of religion, literature and art, comparable to that of the glorious epoch of the Guptas. In the history of these activities the names of three Central Indian localities stand pre-eminent: Vidiśā (Besnagar), Gonarda and Bhārhut. As Foucher points out "it was the ivory-workers of Vidiśā who carved, in the immediate vicinity of their town, one of the monumental gates of Sāñchī." Inscriptions at or near Vidiśā (and Ghosuṇḍī) testify to the growing importance and wide prevalence of the *Bhāgavata* religion. Though no Aśoka arose to champion this faith, the missionary propaganda of its votaries must have been effective even in the realms of Yavana princes, and a Yavana *dūta* or ambassador was one of its most notable converts. Gonarda[3] was the traditional birth-place of the celebrated Patañjali, the greatest literary genius of the period, Bhārhut saw the construction of the famous railing which has made the sovereignty of the Śuṅgas (*Suganaṁ raja*) immortal.

[1] *Ibid.,* 49.

[2] For the location of Purikā see *JRAS,* 1910, 446; Cf. *Ep. Ind.,* xxvi, 151.

[3] See *IHQ,* 1926, 267. According to the *Sutta Nipāta* Gonarda stood midway between Ujjain and Besnagar (Vidiśā)—*Carm. Lec.,* 1918, 4; *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society,* Jan., 1935, pp. 1ff. (Sircar's trans. of S. Lévi's note on Gonarda).

CHAPTER VII. THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS

SECTION 1. THE KĀṆVAS, THE LATER ŚUṄGAS AND THE LATER MITRAS

Vasudeva at whose instance the "over-libidinous Śuṅga" was "reft of his life" founded about 75 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty. The *Purāṇas* give the following account of this family. "He (Vasudeva), the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyaṇa will reign 12 years. His son Suśarman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the *Śuṅga-bhṛitya* Kāṇvāyana kings. These four Kāṇva Brāhmaṇas will enjoy the earth.[1] They will be righteous. In succession to them the 'earth' will pass to the Andhras." **Bhūmimitra** may have been identical with the king of that name known from coins.[2]

The chronology of the Kāṇva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his *Early History of the Deccan*, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes, the founder of the Andhra-bhṛityas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāṇvas,

[1] Possibly only Eastern Mālwa where stood the later "Śuṅga" capital Vidiśā or Besnagar, and some adjoining tracts.

[2] Mr. J. C. Ghosh is inclined to include among the Kāṇva kings a ruler named Sarvatāta who is known (from the Ghosuṇḍi Inscription, *Ind. Ant.*, 1932, Nov., 203ff; *Ep. Ind.*, xxii. 198ff) to have been a devotee of Samkarshaṇa and Vāsudeva and a performer of the horse-sacrifice. But the identification of the Gājāyana family, to which the king belonged, with the Gādāyanas or Godāyanas (cf. *IHQ*, 1933, 797ff) does not seem to be plausible. There seems to be no more reason to identify the Gājāyanas with the Gādāyanas than with the Gāhāyanas or Gāṅgāyanas of the Śunaka or Kaśyapa group (Caland, *Baudh. Śrauta sūtra* III, 423-454). It is important to remember the fact that the *Harivaṁśa* refers to a *Kaśyapa dvija* as the reviver of the *Aśvamedha* in the Kali Age. The Gāṅgāyanas no doubt also recall the Gaṅgas of Mysore who claimed to belong to the Kāṇvāyana *gotra* (*A New History of the Indian People*, Vol. VI, p. 248). But the equation Gājāyana = Gāṅgāyana is not proved.

but 'whatever was left of the power of the Śuṅgas'. And the Kāṇvas are pointedly spoken of as Śuṅga-bhṛityas or servants of the Śuṅgas. It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṅvas.

Now, the Purāṇic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śuṅga stock continued to rule till the so-called "Andhra-bhṛitya" conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these *rois faineants* of the "Śuṅga" stock were identical with any of the ten "Śuṅga" kings mentioned by name in the Purāṇic lists, who reigned 112 years. On the contrary, the distinct testimony of the *Purāṇas* that Devabhūti, the tenth and last "Śuṅga" of the Purāṇic lists, was the person slain by Vasudeva, the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the *rois faineants,* who ruled contemporaneously with Vasudeva and his successors, were later than Devabhūti, and were not considered to be important enough to be mentioned by name. Consequently the 112 years that tradition assigns to the ten "Śuṅga" kings from Pushyamitra to Devabhūti do not include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to accept with slight modifications the views of Dr. Smith regarding the date of the family. According to the system of chronology adopted in these pages, the period of Kāṇva rule extended from *cir.* B.C. 75 to *cir.* B.C. 30.

Very little is known about the history of Magadha proper after the Kāṇvas. To reconstruct the history of the province from the fall of the Kāṇvas to the rise of the Gupta dynasty is a difficult task. The so-called Andhras or Śātavāhanas who are represented as destroying the Kāṇva sovereignty, apparently in Eastern Mālwa, do not

appear to have ruled in Magadha proper.[1] The greatest among them are called 'Sovereigns of the Deccan' (*Dakshiṇāpathapati*) and an accurate idea of the field of their political and military activities may be obtained from the epithets '*tisamuda-toyapītavāhana*', 'whose chargers had drunk the water of the *three* oceans', and '*triśamudrādhipati*', 'overlord of the *three* seas' occurring in epigraphic and literary records. The sway of rulers like the Guptas, on the other hand, is said to have extended as far as the *four* seas.

The discovery of a clay seal with the legend *Mokhaliṇam*[2] suggests that at one time the Gayā region was under the sway of Maukhari chiefs. But the precise date of the record is not known. Equally uncertain is the date of *Mahārājā* Trikamala who ruled in the same region in the year 64 of an unspecified era. Epigraphic evidence of a late date points to some connection between the Lichchhavis and Pushpapura (Pāṭaliputra). But it is difficult to say how far the tradition is genuine. The only rulers of note in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, whom we know from epigraphic evidence to have ruled in Magadha and the neighbouring provinces, are the so-called **'Mitras'.** The prevalence of 'Mitra' rule is also hinted at by references in Jaina literature to Balamitra and Bhānumitra among the successors of Pushyamitra. From a study of available epigraphs Dr. Barua has compiled a list of 'Mitra kings'.

[1] There is no valid reason for connecting the Nūrruvar Kannar (*Silappadikaram*, xxvi, Dikshitar's trans. 299f.) either with the Śātakarṇis or with Magadha. The expression "Kannar" sometimes stands alone proving that Nūrruvar is only a qualifying adjective, not a part of the name. The Ganges, even if it be the Bhāgirathī, and not Gautamī Gaṅgā or the Godāvarī, with which the family is associated, flows through other territories besides Magadha, showing that there is no necessary connection between that province and the kings in question.

[2] Fleet, CII, 14. The legend is written in Mauryan Brāhmī. The Maukharis in question may have exercised sway over some little principality under the suzerainty of the Mauryas or the Śuṅgas. Three inscriptions have recently been discovered at Baḍvā in the Kotah State in Rājputāna recording the erection of sacrificial pillars by Maukhari *Mahāsenāpatis* (generals or military governors) in the third century A.D. (*Ep. Ind.*, XXIII, 52).

It includes the names of Bṛihatsvātimitra, Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra, Bṛihaspatimitra, (Dhar)mamitra and Vishṇumitra. To these should perhaps be added the names of Varuṇamitra and Gomitra.[1] Of these only Indrāgnimitra, Brahmamitra and possibly Bṛihaspatimitra are definitely associated with Magadha in addition to other territories. The rest are connected with Kauśāmbī and Mathurā.

It is not known in what relationship most of these "Mitra" kings stood to one another or to the celebrated families of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas.

In Pāṭaliputra as well as in Mathurā the "Mitras" seem to have been replaced eventually by the Scythian 'Muruṇḍas' and Satraps who, in their turn, were supplanted by the Nāgas and the Guptas. Some scholars place immediately before the Guptas a family called Kota which may have ruled in Pāṭaliputra.[2]

SECTION II. THE ŚĀTAVĀHANAS AND THE CHETAS

While the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas were engaged in their petty feuds, new powers were rising in trans-Vindhyan India. These were the Śātavāhana[3] (the so-called Andhra or Andhra-bhṛitya[4]) kingdom of Dakshiṇāpatha and the Cheta or Cheti kingdom of Kaliṅga.

[1] Allan refers to kings Brahmamitra, Dṛidhamitra, Suryamitra and Vishṇumitra who issued coins identical in type with those of Gomitra. They were followed by rulers whose names ended in—*datta*,—*bhūti* and—*ghosha*.

[2] For statements in this section see *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, 60ff; *Harshacharita* VIII, (p. 251); Cunn., *Mahābodhi*, *ASI*, 1908-9, 141; *IHQ*, 1926, 441; 1929, 398, 595f; 1930, 1ff. 1933, 419; Kielhorn, N. I. Inscriptions, No. 541; *Indian Culture*, I, 695; *EHI*, 3rd ed. 227n; *JRAS*, 1912, 122; Smith, *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum*, 185, 190, 194; Allan, *CICAI*, pp. xcvi-xcviii, cx, 150ff, 169ff, 173ff, 195ff, 202ff.

[3] The form Sātivāhana is found in the Bhāgalpur Grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and the form Sālivāhana in literature. See also Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *EHD*, Section VII.

[4] The designation '*Andhra-jātīya*' or 'Andhra' is found in the *Purāṇas* which represent the founder as a *bhṛitya* or servant of the last Kāṇva king. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, following apparently the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, styles the dynasty founded by Simuka *Andhra-bhṛitya*, *i.e.*, *Andhras* who were once servants. But that designation should properly be applied to the seven Ābhiras who are mentioned as the successors of the line of Simuka on page 45 of Pargiter's *Dynasties of the Kali Age* (cf. *Vishṇu P.*, IV. 24, 13).

The founder of the **Sātavāhana** dynasty was **Simuka** whose name is misspelt as Siśuka, Sindhuka and Śipraka in the *Purāṇas*. Those works state that the "Andhra" Simuka will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and Suśarman, and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas' power and will obtain this "earth". If this statement be true then it cannot be denied that Simuka was for some years a contemporary of Suśarman (40-30 B.C.) and flourished in the first century B.C. Rapson, Smith and many other scholars, however, reject the *unanimous* testimony of the *Purāṇas*. They attach more importance to a statement about which there is not the same unanimity, that the "Andhras" ruled for four centuries and a half. Accordingly, they place Simuka towards the close of the third century B.C., and say that the dynasty came to an end in the third century A.D.

A discussion of Simuka's date involves the consideration of the following questions: —

1. What is the age of the script of the Nānāghāṭ record of Nāyanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka (or of his brother and successor, Kṛishṇa)?

2. What is the actual date of Khāravela's Hāthīgumphā Inscription which refers to a Śātakarṇi, who was apparently a successor of Simuka?

3. What is the exact number of the so-called Andhra kings and what is the duration of their rule?

As to the first point we should note that according to Mr. R. P. Chanda the inscription of Nāyanikā is later than the Besnagar Inscription of Bhāgavata, possibly the penultimate king of the "line" of Pushyamitra mentioned in the *Purāṇas*.[1] Consequently Simuka may be placed in

[1] MAST, No. 1. pp. 14-15. In IHQ, 1929 (p. 601) Mr. Chanda points to the agreement of the Nānāghāṭ script with the Besnagar Inscription of the time of Antialkidas. But the exact date of Antialkidas is uncertain. He may have belonged to the latter half of the second century B.C. or the first half of the next century.

Mr. R. D. Banerji, while disagreeing with the views of Mr. Chanda in regard to certain points, admits, after a detailed examination of certain epigraphs, that "the Nānāghāṭ inscriptions show the use of a very large number of Ksatrapa or early Kuṣaṇa forms side by side with older ones" (*Mem. Asiat*

the Kāṇva period, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C.—a date which accords with Purāṇic evidence.[1]

As to the second point Mr. R. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression *Ti-vasasata* occurring in the passage "*Paṁchame che dāni vase Namdarāja ti-vasa-sata............*" of the Hāthīgumphā Inscription means not 103 but 300.[2] This was also the view of Mr. Chanda and, at one time, of Dr. Jayaswal.[3] If *Ti-vasa-sata* means 300, Khāravela and his contemporary Śātakarṇi may have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, *i.e.*, in or about 24 B.C. This agrees with

Soc., Bengal, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 145). According to Rapson (*Andhra Coins*, lxxvii) the form of the *akshara-'da'* found in the *Nānāghāṭ* record resembles that of a coin-legend which is assignable to the first or second century B.C.

It is not suggested that either Banerji or Rapson placed the Nānāghāṭ record in the first century B.C. But some of the facts they have placed before us do not preclude the possibility of a date in the first century B.C. The theory that the record belongs to the second century B.C. rests in some measure on the assumption tacitly accepted by the older generation of scholars that Khāravela's thirteenth year corresponds to the year 165 of the time of the Maurya kings (Bühler, *Indian Palaeography*, 39; Rapson, xvii).

1 Bühler also observes (ASWI., Vol. V, 65) that the characters of the Nānāghāṭ inscriptions belong to a period anterior by about 100 years to that of the edicts of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi and his son Pulumāyi. Scholars who place the Nānāghāṭ record in the first half of the second century B.C., and the epigraphs of the time of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi in the second century A.D., will have to account for the paucity of Śātavāhana records during a period of about three hundred years (if that be the actual length of the interval between the age of the husband of Nāganikā and the reign of the son of Balaśrī). Mr. N. G. Majumdar (*The Monuments of Sānchī*, Vol. I, pt. iv, p. 277) places the Nānāghāṭ record during the period 100-75 B.C.

2 JBORS, 1917, 495-497.

3 JBORS, 1917, 432; *cf.* 1918, 377, 385. The older view was changed in 1927, 238, 244. According to the usually accepted interpretation of a passage in the Hāthīgumphā record Khāravela, in his fifth year, extended an aqueduct that had not been used for "*ti-vasa-sata*" since Nandarāja. If "*ti-vasa-sata*" is taken to mean 103 years, Khāravela's accession must be placed 103—5=98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of *Yuvarāja* took place 9 years before the date, *i.e.*, 98—9=89 years after Nandarāja (*i.e.*, not later than 324 B.C.—89=235 B.C.). Khāravela's father was apparently on the throne at that time, and he seems to have been preceded by *his* father. But we learn from Aśoka's inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya *Kumāra* under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore "*ti-vasa-sata*" should be taken to mean 300, and not 103 years. The figure 'three hundred' (a round number) is in substantial agreement with the *Purānic* tradition about the interval between the Nandas and Sātakarṇi I, 137 (period of the Mauryas)+112 (of the Suṅgas)+45 (of the Kāṇvas)+23 (of Simuka)+10 (of Kṛishṇa)=327.

the Purāṇic evidence according to which Śātakarṇi's father (or uncle) Simuka assailed the last Kāṇva king Suśarman (*c.* 40-30 B.C.).[1]

We now come to the third point, *viz.*, the determination of the exact number of Śātavāhana kings, and the duration of their rule.

Regarding each of these matters we have got in the *Purāṇas* quite a number of different traditions. As to the first the *Matsya Purāṇa* says—

"*Ekona-viṁśatir*[2] *hyete Andhrā bhokshyanti vai mahīm,*" but it gives thirty names.[3]

The *Vāyu Purāṇa*, with the exception of the '*M*' manuscript, says—

"*Ityete vai nṛipās triṁśad Andhrā bhokshyanti ye mahīm*" (these thirty Andhras will enjoy the earth); but most of the *Vāyu* manuscripts name only seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen kings.

As to the duration of the Andhra rule several *Matsya* manuscripts assign to them a period of 460 years.

"*Teshāṁ varsha satāni syuś chatvāri shashṭir eva-cha.*"

Another *Matsya* manuscript puts it slightly differently:—

"*Dvādaśādhikam eteshāṁ rājyaṁ śata-chatushṭayam*" *i.e.*, the period of their sovereignty is 412 years; while the reigns of kings mentioned in certain *Vāyu* Mss. amount, according to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, to only 272 years and a half.

Obviously according to one tradition there were about seventeen, eighteen or nineteen kings, whose rule lasted some three centuries, while according to another tradition there were thirty kings, the length of whose reigns covered

[1] Simuka may have ascended the throne (in the Deccan) several years before the date 40-30 B.C. when he assailed the Kāṇvāyanas possibly in Central India. The period of his rule after the defeat of the Kāṇvas may have been less than 23 years. Thus the actual interval between the Nandas and Śātakarṇi may well have been a little less than 327 years.

[2] Variant *ekoṇa-navatiṁ* (DKA, 43).

[3] Pargiter points out (p. 36) that 3 *Matsya* Mss. name 30 and the others vary the number from 18 to 21.

a period of more than 400 years. In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the longer list includes the names of princes belonging to all the branches of the so-called *Andhra-bhṛitya* dynasty, and that the longer period represents the total duration of all the princes belonging to the several branches. The period of about three centuries, and the seventeen, eighteen or nineteen names given in the *Vāyu Purāṇa,* and hinted at in the *Matsya,* refer to the main branch. That there were several families of Śātavāhanas or Śātakārṇis, distinct from the main line that had its *principal* seat in the upper Valley of the Godāvarī, cannot be denied. The *Kāvya Mīmāṁsā* of Rājaśekhara and several other works as well as epigraphs in the Kanarese country and elsewhere testify to the existence of Śātavāhanas and Śātakarṇis who ruled over Kuntala[1] (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas. The fullest *Matsya* list includes a group of kings (Nos. 10-14), including one named "Kuntala" Śātakarṇi, who are, generally speaking, passed over in silence by the *Vāyu.*[2] Skandasvāti, No. 11 of the full list, reminds one of *Skandanāga-Śātaka,* a prince of a Kanarese line of Śātakarṇis mentioned in a Kanheri inscription.[3] As to Kuntala Śātakarṇi (No. 13), the commentary on Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* takes the word "Kuntala" in the name Kuntala Śātakarṇi Śātavāhana to mean "*Kuntala-vishaye jātatvāt tat samākhyah.*"[4] It is, therefore, fair to conclude that the *Matsya* MSS. which mention 30 Śātavāhana kings

[1] A Śātavāhana of Kuntala is referred to by the *Kāvya-Mīmāṁsā* (1934, Ch. X, p. 50) as having ordered the exclusive use of *Prākrit* in his harem He may have been identical with the famous king Hāla (*cf. Kuntala-janavaya ṇena Hālena*, ibid., Notes, p. 197).

[2] Even Hāla (No. 17) is omitted in the *Vāyu* Ms. (*DKA*, p. 36) and the *Brahmāṇḍa P.* (Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, lxvii).

[3] Rapson, *Andhra Coins,* liii. The fact that he was a prince at the time of the record need not prove that he never came to the throne. The *Purāṇic* lists themselves often include names of princes (*e.g.*, Arjuna, Abhimanyu, Siddhārtha) who never ruled as kings. Certain *Matsya* Mss. insert the group to which Skandasvāti belongs after No. 29, *i.e., Chaṇḍaśrī* (*DKA*, p. 36).

[4] He was so named because he was born in the Kuntala country. *Cf.* names like Uruvela-Nadi-and Gayā Kassapa (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 194).

include not only the main group of kings but also those who were closely associated with Kuntala.

On the other hand, the *Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa* and certain *Matsya* MSS., generally speaking, show a tendency to omit the Śātavāhanas of Kuntala and the rulers of the period of Śaka revival under Rudra-dāman I, and mention only about 19 kings most of whom belonged to the main line whose rule may have lasted for about three centuries. If the main line of Śātavāhana kings consisted only of about nineteen princes, and if the duration of their rule be approximately three centuries, there is no difficulty in accepting the Purāṇic statement that Simuka flourished in the time of the later Kāṇvas, that is to say, in the first century B.C., and that his dynasty ceased to rule in the Northern Deccan in the third century A.D. The sovereignty of the Śātavāhanas and Śātakarṇis of Kuntala lasted longer and did not come to an end probably before the fourth century A.D., when it was ended by the Kadambas. Thus the total duration of the rule of all the lines of Śātakarṇis is really more than 400 years[1]. The kings of the Kuntala group (Nos. 10-14 of the DKA list) are no doubt usually placed before the great Gautamīputra and his successors. But Pargiter points out that in certain *Matsya* MSS. Nos. 10-15 are placed after the penultimate king of the line (No. 29).[2] As to Hāla (No. 17) if he is really the author of the *Gāthāsaptaśatī*, he could hardly have flourished before the fourth century A.D. The references to *Vikramāditya-charita, Aṅgārakavāra* and Rādhikā make it difficult to assign to him a date before the Great Gautamīputra. We have many other

[1] The period '300 years' (*Vāyu P*) may refer to the rule of the *Śrīparvatiya* Andhras (DKA, 46). Even then it is important to remember that the cessation of "Andhra" rule in the upper Deccan in the third century A.D. is not incompatible with a date for the founder in the first century B.C. For the rule of the Śātakarṇis survived in Kuntala till the rise of the Kadambas. Thus the *Purāṇas* are right in assigning to the entire line of 30 kings a period of about four centuries and a half.

[2] DKA, p. 36. On pp. 20, 35, Pargiter gives other instances of 'misplacement' of kings by the Purāṇic MSS.

instances of the inversion of the order of kings in the *Purāṇas*.[1] The fact that the extant Purāṇic texts do misplace kings appears abundantly clear from the important discovery of a coin of Śiva Śrī Āpīlaka whom Mr. Dikshit connects with the *later* Sātavāhanas though the *Purāṇas* place him *early* in the list.[2]

[1] See pp. 104, 115f *ante*.

[2] See *Advance*, March 10, 1935, p. 9. The coin belongs to the Mahākosala society of Raipur (C.P.). It bears the figure of an elephant with Brāhmī legend on the obverse. The reverse is blank. On numismatic grounds the place of this ruler is according to Mr. K. N. Dikshit, more with the later kings of the dynasty than with the earlier ones as indicated in the *Purāṇas*. For the late date of Hāla of the Kuntala country see *R. G. Bhand. Com. Vol.*, 189. *Cf.* Reference to Rādhā in the *Saptaśatakam* (*Ind. Ant.*, III. 25n.).

Mr. K. P. Chattopādhyāya deduces from the discrepant lists of the *Matsya*, and *Vāyu Purāṇas* and from epigraphic and numismatic evidence, certain theories about (1) the existence of two *contemporary* Sātavāhana kingdom *ruled by son and father* respectively, (2) cross-cousin marriages and (3) matrilineal succession, which he discusses in JASB, 1927, 503ff and 1939, 317-339 In his opinion the discrepancies in the Purāṇic lists cannot be due to any oversight or slip on the part of the editors (1927, p. 504). They are to be explained by the theory of an original version (that contained in the *Matsya*) which gives the full list of Gautamīputras as well as Vāsishṭhīputras, and a "revised text" (contained in the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa*) which retains the Gautamīputras but from which certain names were deliberately expunged as the rulers in question were not considered by the revising authorities to possess the privilege of having the names preserved in the *Purāṇas* (*ibid.*, p. 505). Kings (*e.g.*, Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāvi), whose names are "expunged" from the "revised text" of the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*, belong to a "set" which is genealogically connected with the other, *viz.*, the Gautamīputra group, whose names are retained in the revised versions, but "the succession did not coincide with the mode of descent". For instance, Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, according to the revised list, was succeeded not by his son Pulumāvi, but by another Gautamīputra, *viz.*, Yajña Śrī (p 509). It is further added that 'on the coins of the Sātavāhanas the royal prefix and the mother's clan-name are associated together and also disappear together except in the case of the third king of the line'. In the inscriptions also the association is anvariable (excluding the doubtful case of Śivamakasada), except in the case of the third king, Śrī Sātakarṇi of the Nānāghāṭ Cave Inscriptions. It is, therefore, to be concluded that, except for the third king of the line, the royal title and relationship to the mother went together. In other words, the succession was matrilineal (p. 518); "The son succeeded to the conquered realm, and the sister's son to the inherited kingdom" (p. 527).

This footnote cannot afford space for an exhaustive review of the dissertation of Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. Nor is it concerned with theories and speculations about social organisation based on 'mother right or father right', cross-cousin marriage in general, and royal successions, that are not germane to the discussion about the Sātavāhana dynasty. We shall try to confine ourselves to the points that are really relevant to an enquiry about that illustrious line itself. A study of the Purāṇic lists analysed by Pargiter (*Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 35ff.) would show that the discrepancies in the Purāṇic lists

Regarding the *original home* of the Śātavāhana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars

are not capable of as simple a solution as that proposed by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. It cannot be said, for example, that Gautamīputra (No. 23) is mentioned in all *Matsya* texts and retained in all *Vāyu* MSS., and that his son Pulumāvi (No. 24) of the so-called "Vāsishṭhīputra group" is always mentioned in the *Matsya* and omitted only in "later revised versions" of the *Vāyu*, etc. Gautamīputra is omitted in *Matsya* MSS., styled *e*, *k* and *l* by Pargiter (p. 36), and also in the *e Vāyu* MSS., while his son Pulumāvi is omitted in *Matsya e*, *f* and *l* MSS. but mentioned in the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata lists*, notwithstanding the activities of the so-called revisers. The theory of succession of sisters' sons in the so-called revised list of the *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, etc., is clearly negatived by numerous passages where a successor is distinctly referred to even in these *Purāṇas* as the son of a predecessor (*cf.* the cases not only of the first Sri Śātakarṇi but also of Śātakarṇi II, Lambodara, and even Yajña Śri (*DKA*, p 39, fn. 40, 44; p. 42, fn. 12.). The use of the expression *tato* (*DKA*, 39) in the *Matsya Purāṇa* to indicate the relationship between Śātakarni I and Pūrṇotsaṅga when taken along with the words *tasyāpi Pūrṇotsaṅgaḥ* (*Vishṇu* IV. 24. 12), and *Paurṇamāsastu tat sūtaḥ* (*Bhāg*. XII. 1. 21) leaves no room for doubt that Purāṇic evidence represents Pūrnotsaṅga—Paurṇamāsa, as the son and immediate successor of Śātakarṇi I and not a 'distant' offspring or a remote offshoot of a 'cross-cousin marriage', who got the throne by the rule of matrilineal succession. There may be no valid reason as asserted by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya for identifying him with Vediśrī of the Nānāghāṭ record. But the reading Vediśrī as pointed out by K. Śāstrī is wrong. The proper reading is Khandasiri—Skandaśrī. This prince has been plausibly identified with Pūrṇotsaṅga's successor, the fifth king of the Purāṇic list. It is, therefore, difficult to agree with the view (JASB, 1939, 325) that the prince in question (the so-called Vediśrī) 'never came to the throne'. Pūrṇotsaṅga may have been some other '*kumāra*'. *Cf.*, the nameless prince (*kumāra*) 'Śātavāhana' of the Nānāghāṭ record who is mentioned along with 'Hakusiri' (Śaktiśri). It is also to be noted that even the so-called older version of the *Matsya* speaks of only 19 kings in one passage.

The Gautamīputras and the Vāsishṭhīputras did not rule over distinct regions. Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi is represented as the *Rājā* of Mūlaka, *i.e.*, the district round Paithan, along with other territories. Pulumāvi, too, ruled over Paiṭhan as we learn from the Geography of Ptolemy. The epithets "*Vijha* ....*Malaya-Mahida* .... .*pavata pati*" and "*tisamudatoyapīta-vāhana*" applied to Gautamīputra suggest that he was as much entitled to the designation *Dakshiṇāpathapati* as his son.

The statement that, except for the third king, the royal title and relationship to the mother went together, is not borne out by recorded facts. In the Myākadoni Inscription, for example (EP. Ind., XIV, pp. 153ff.), we have the passage—*Raño Sātavāhanānaṁ s* (*i*) *ri-Pulum* (*ā*) *visa* without any mention of the metronymic *Cf*. also the passage *Raño Sirichaḍa-sātisa* (Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, p. 32). As to cross-cousin marriages, several *recorded* cases, *e.g.*, those of the wives of Śrī Śātakarṇi I and Vāsishṭhīputra Śrī-Śātakarṇi of the Kanheri Inscription, do not support the theory propounded by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. The kings in question may, doubtless, have been polygamous. But that the extra queens, if any, included cousins is only a *guess*. The marriages actually hinted at in the epigraphic records of the Śātavāhanas (unlike those of the

think that the Śātavāhanas were not Andhras (Telugus) but merely Andhra-bhṛityas, servants of the Andhras, of Kanarese origin. Mr. O. C. Gangoly points out[1] that in some class of literature a distinction is suggested between the Āndhras and the Śātavāhanas. In the *Epigraphia Indica*,[2] Dr. Sukṭhankar edited an inscription of Siri-Pulumāvi, "king of the Śātavāhanas," which refers to a place called Sātavahanihāra.[3] The place finds mention also in the Hīrahadagalli copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Siva-skandavarman in the slightly altered form of Sātāhani-raṭṭha. Dr. Sukṭhankar suggests that the territorial division Sātavahani-Sātāhani must have comprised a good portion of the modern Bellary district of the Madras Presidency, and that it was the original home of the Śātavāhana family. Other indications point to the territory immediately south of the *Madhyadeśa* as the original home of the Śātavāhana-Śātakarṇis. The *Vinaya Texts*[4] mention a town called "*Setakannika*" which lay on the southern frontier of the *Majjhima-deśa*. It is significant that the earliest records of the Śātakarṇis are found in the Northern Deccan and Central India; and

Ikshvākus) are not of the 'cross-cousin' type. Indian history knows of cases where a queen or other royal personage takes as much pride in the mother's family as in that of the father (*cf. ubhayakulālaṅkārabhūtā* Prabhāvatī, JASB, 1924, 58). Does Nāyanikā lay any claim to a Śātavāhana origin? The table of cross-cousin marriage on p. 325 of JASB, 1939, would make Śātakarṇi (No 6 of the list) a brother of Nāyanikā and a brother-in-law of Śātakarṇi (No. 3 of the list) and a son of Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro. This is negatived by the Nānāghāt epigraph which refers to the Mahāraṭhi as *Aṁgiya (or Āmbhiya) kulavardhana*, whereas both the Śātakarṇis belong to the family of Simuka Śātavāhana according to Purāṇic evidence Gautamī-Balaśrī who is turned into a sister or clan-sister of Śivasvāti (JASB, 1927, 590) refers merely to her position as a *badhū, mātā*, and *pitāmahī*, but never for once suggests that she herself sprang from the family restoration of whose glory is referred to in exulting terms.

[1] *JAHRS*, XI, pp 1 and 2, pp. 14-15. The Āndhras contributed one melody which is recognised in the musical literature of India as *Āndhrī*, while the Śātavāhanas contributed another named after them as Śātavāhanī according to the text of the *Bṛihat-Deśī*.

[2] Vol. XIV (1917).

[3] See also *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, 1918-19, p. 21, '*On the Home of the so-called Andhra Kings*.'—V. S. Sukṭhankar, Cf. *JRAS*, 1923, 89 f.

[4] SBE, XVII, 38.

the Hāthīgumphā Inscription of Khāravela, king of Orissa, refers to the family as 'protecting the *West*'. The name 'Andhra' probably came to be applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became a purely Andhra power, governing the territory at the mouth of the river Kṛishṇā.[1] The Sātavāhanas themselves never claim an 'Andhra' ancestry.

There is reason to believe that the so-called "Andhra," "Andhra-bhṛitya" or Śātavāhana kings were Brāhmaṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The *Dvātriṁśat-puttalikā* represents Sālivāhana (*Prākṛit* form of Śātavāhana) as of mixed **Brāhmana and Nāga origin**[2] The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Nāga-nikā[3] and Skanda-nāga-Śātaka, while the claim to the rank of Brāhmaṇa is actually put forward in an inscription. In the Nāsik *praśasti* of Gautamîputra Śātakarṇi the king is called *"Eka Bamhaṇa,"* i.e., the unique Brāhmaṇa. Some scholars, however, are inclined to take *Bamhaṇa* to mean merely a Brāhmaṇical Hindu, but this interpretation cannot be accepted in view of the fact that Gautamîputra is also called *"Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana,"* i.e., the destroyer of the pride and conceit of Kshatriyas. The expression *"Eka Bamhaṇa"* when read along with the passage *"Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana"* leaves no room for doubt that Gautamîputra of the Śātavāhana family not only claimed to be a Brāhmaṇa,[4] but a Brāhmaṇa like

[1] *Cf.* The transformation of the Eastern Chālukyas into Cholas from the time when Kulottunga I mounted the Chola throne. For the origin and meaning of the names Śātavāhana and Śātakarṇi see also *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, Vol. I. p. 599n, JBORS, 1917, December, p. 442n; IHQ, 1929, 388; 1933, 88, 256 and JRAS, 1929, April, also *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, London, 1938, IX. 2. 327f. Both Barnett and Jayaswal connect them with the Sātiya-putas. Przyluski thinks that the names may have been Sanskritised from Austro-Asiatic terms signifying, "Son of horse". For other interpretations see Aravamuthan, *The Kaveri, the Maukharis*, p. 51n (*karṇi* = ship; *Vāhana* = Oar or Sail); Dikshitar, *Indian Culture*, II, 549ff.

[2] *Cf.* EHD, Sec. VII.

[3] Bühler, ASWI, Vol. V, p. 64 n4.

[4] In *Indian Culture*, I, pp. 513ff. and *Ep. Ind.*, XXII. 32ff. Miss Bhramar Ghosh and Dr. Bhandarkar seem to reject the interpretation of the expressions "*Eka Bamhaṇa*" and "*Khatiya-dapa-māna-madana*" proposed by Senart and Bühler. It is suggested that the word *bamhaṇa* may stand for

Paraśurāma who humbled the pride of the Kshatriyas. As a matter of fact in the *praśasti* the king is described as "the unique Brāhmaṇā in prowess equal to Rāma."[1]

According to the *Purāṇas* Simuka (c. 60-37 B.C.) gave the final *coup de grace* to the Śuṅga-Kāṇva power. He was succeeded by his brother **Kṛishṇa** (c. 37-27 B.C.). This king has been identified with Kaṇha "*Rājā* of the Sādavāhana-*kula*" mentioned in a Nāsik Inscription. The record tells us that a certain cave was caused to be made by a high official (*Śramaṇa Mahāmātra*) of Nāsik in the time of King Kaṇha.

Brahmaṇya, that *Khattya* may refer to the Xathroi or Khatriaioi tribe mentioned by classical writers, and that the expression *Rājaṁsi-vadhu* used in reference to Gautamī Balaśrī is enough to show that the Śātavāhana rulers never claimed themselves to be *Brahmarshis* or Brāhmaṇa sages. It is nobody's case that the Śātavāhanas claimed to be mere "Brāhmaṇa sages." But is it not a bit too ingenious to imagine that the well-known terms Brāhmaṇa and Kshatriya are not to be taken in their ordinary sense, and that they really stand for non-Brāhmaṇas and non-Kshatriyas? As to the use of the expression *Rājaṁsi-vadhu*, would not *Brahmarshi* be a singularly inappropriate description of a family of *kings* even though they were Brāhmaṇas? The term *Rājarshi* is not used exclusively to denote non-Brāhmaṇa rulers. In the *Padma Purāṇa* (*Pātāla-khaṇḍam, 61*, 75), for instance, Dadhīchi is styled a *Rājarshi*. In the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (57, 121ff.) the epithets "*Rājarshayo mahāshattvāḥ*" are used in reference to *Brahma-Kshatramayā nṛipāḥ*, (*Brahma-kshatrādayo nṛipāḥ*, according to the reading of the *Matsya* text, *143*, 37: 40). In the *Matsya Purāṇa* (*50*. 5-7) the epithet *Rājarshi* is applied to a king who sprang from the family of the Maudgalyas who are called *Kshatropetā dvijātayaḥ* and one of whom is styled *Brahmishthaḥ*. The *Annadāmaṅgala* refers to Kṛishṇa Chandra as *Rāja-Rājachakravartī Rishi-Rishirāja*.

Attention may no doubt be invited to the Purāṇic statement that the founder of the "Andhra" dynasty was a '*vṛishala*' (DKA, 38). But the explanation will be found in the *Mahābhārata*. The great epic (XII. 63. 1ff.) informs us that 'drawing the bowstring, destruction of enemies . . . are not proper (*akārayam paramam*) for a Brāhmaṇa. A Brāhmaṇa should avoid royal service (*rāja-preshya*). A Brāhmaṇa who marries a *Vṛishalī* and takes to royal service (*rāja-preshya*) and other work not legitimate for him is *akarmā*, a Brāhmaṇa so-called (*Brahma-bandhu*). He becomes a Śūdra. The Śātavāhanas actually drew the bowstring and intermarried with Dravidians and Śakas as the Mauryas had intermarried with Yavanas.

[1] A pun is here intended as Rāma seems to refer to Bala Deva as well. The use of the name of Rāma instead of Bala (*cf.* Bala-Keśava in *Hariv.*, *Vishṇuparva, 52*. 20) is significant. Taken in conjunction with *ekabamhaṇa* it undoubtedly implies comparison with Bhṛigu-Rāma or Paraśu-Rāma as well. The comparison of a militant ruler claiming Brāhmaṇahood and fighting against Kshatriyas, with Paraśu-Rāma is a favourite theme of writers of *Praśastis*—cf. *Bhṛigupatiriva dṛipta kshatrasaṅhāra-kārin* which is applied to Ambāprasād in the Chitor-gaḍh Ins. of 1274 A.D.

Kaṇha-Krishṇa was succeeded according to the *Purāṇas* by **Sātakarṇi** (c. 27-17 B.C.). This Śātakarṇi has been identified with—

(1) King Śātakarṇi *Dakshiṇāpatha-pati* (lord of the Deccan), son (or nephew) of Simuka Śātavāhana, mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription of Nāyanikā[1];

(2) Śātakarṇi, lord of the west, who was defied (or rescued?) by Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga;

(3) *Rājan* Śri Śātakarṇi of a Sāñchī Inscription;

(4) The elder Saraganus mentioned in the *Periplus*;

(5) Śātakarṇi, lord of Pratishṭhāna, father of Śakti-kumāra, mentioned in Indian literature; and

(6) Siri-Sāta of coins.[2]

The first, fifth and sixth identifications are usually accepted by all scholars. The second identification is also probable because the *Purāṇas* place Śātakarṇi, the successor of Kṛishṇa, after the Kāṇvas, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C., while the Hāthīgumphā Inscription seems to place Khāravela 300 years after Nanda-rāja, *i.e.*, possibly in the first century B.C.

Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Śrī Sātakarṇi who is mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ and Hāthīgumphā Inscriptions reigned in the middle of the second century B.C.; his dominions, therefore, could not, in his opinion, have included Eastern Mālwa (the Sāñchī region) which, in the second century B.C., was ruled by the Śuṅgas and not by the "Andhras".[3] But we have seen that the date of the Hāthīgumphā Inscription is possibly the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). The *Purāṇas*, too, as is well known, place the kings mentioned in the Nānāghāṭ Inscription

[1] The usual view among scholars is that Śātakarṇi I is a *son* of Simuka. If he is a nephew (son of Krishṇa, brother of Simuka) as the *Purāṇas* assert, it is difficult to explain why Krishṇa's name should be omitted from the family group, mentioned in the Nānāghaṭ records, while the name of Simuka as well as that of the father of Śātakarṇi's queen should find prominent mention. The final decision must await future discoveries.

[2] *Andhra Coins*, Rapson, p. xciii. *CHI*, 531.

[3] *A Guide to Sāñchī*, p. 13.

not earliar than the Kāṇvas, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C. As Śuṅga rule had terminated about this time the identification of the successor of Kṛishṇa of the Śātavāhana family with Śātakarṇi of the Sāñchī Inscription, therefore, does not conflict with what is known of the history of Eastern Mālwa in the second century B.C. Lastly, it would be natural for the first Śātakarṇi to be styled simply Śātakarṇi or the elder Śātakarṇi (Saraganus, from a *Prākṛit* form like Sāḍaganna), while it would be equally natural for the later Śātakarṇis to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gautamīputra or Vāsishṭhīputra.

We learn from the Nānāghāṭ Inscriptions that Śātakarṇi, son(?) of Simuka, entered into a matrimonial alliance with the powerful Aṁgiya or Ambhiya[1] family, the scions of which were called Mahārathi, and became sovereign of the whole of Dakshiṇāpatha. He seems also to have controlled Eastern Mālwa and undoubtedly performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. The conquest of Eastern Mālwa by his family is possibly implied by coins and the Sāñchī Inscription when read along with the Purāṇic statement that in succession to the *Śuṅgabhṛitya* Kāṇvāyana kings, the 'earth'[2] will pass to the 'Andhras'. The inscription records the gift of a certain Ānaṁda, the son of Vasiṭhī, the foreman of the artisans of *Rājan* Siri-Śātakarṇi.[3] Śātakarṇi seems to have been the first prince to raise the Śātavāhanas to the position of paramount sovereigns of Trans-Vindhyan India. Thus arose the first great empire in the Godāvarī valley which rivalled in extent and power the Śuṅga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers. According to the

[1] *ASI*, 1923-4, p 88.

[2] *I.e.*, the Vidiśā, region, etc, in Eastern Mālwa. For the connection of the Śuṅgas with Vidiśā, see Pargiter, DKA, 49 The Kāṇvāyanas had become King 'among the Śuṅgas' (Śuṅgeshu, *DKA*, 34), apparently in the Vidiśā territory. *Cf.* also Tewar Coins, IHQ, XXVIII, 1952, 68f.

[3] The conquest of West Mālwa is probably suggested by round coins of Śrī Sāta (Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, xcii-xciii).

evidence of Indian as well as classical writers,[1] the principal capital of the Śātavāhana Empire was at **Pratishṭhāna**, "the modern Paiṭhan on the north bank of the Godāvarî in the Aurangabad District of Hyderabad."

After the death of Śātakarṇi his wife Nāyanikā or Nāganikā, daughter of the Mahārathi Tranakayiro Kalalāya, the scion of the Aṁgiya (?) family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vedaśrî (? Khandasiri or Skandaśrī) and Śakti-Śri (Sati Sirimat) or Haku-Siri. The last-mentioned prince is probably identical with Śakti-kumāra, son of Śālivāhana, mentioned in Jaina literature.[2]

Early Śātavāhanas

The Śātavāhanas were not the only enemies of the decadent Magadha empire in the first century B.C. We learn from the Hāthīgumphā Inscription that when Śātakarṇi was ruling in the west, **Khāravela of Kaliṅga**

[1] *Cf* Jinaprabhasuri, *Tirthakalpa JBBRAS.*, X. 123; and Ptolemy, *Geography*, vii. 1. 82. See also *Avaśyaka Sūtra, JBORS.*, 1930, 290; Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *EHD*, Sec. VII.

[2] *Vīracharitra* Ind. Ant., VIII, 201. *ASWI*, V, 62n.

[3] On page 57 of Rapson's *Andhra Coins* Kalalāya Mahāraṭhi bears the name "Sadakana" (=Śātakarṇi). His other name or epithet "Tranakayiro" reminds us of "Tanaka" which occurs as a variant of the name of the 18th "Andhra" king of Pargiter's list (*DKA*, 36, 41).

[4] *ASI*, AR, 1923-24, p. 88; A. Ghosh, *History of Central and Western India*, 140 Mr. Ghosh identifies him with the fifth king of the Purāṇic list.

carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagṛiha.

Khāravela belonged to the **Cheta** dynasty. Mr. R. P. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the *Vessantara Jātaka*.[1] The *Milinda-pañho* contains a statement which seems to indicate that the Chetas were connected with the Chetis or Chedis. The particulars given in that work regarding the *Cheta* king Sura Parichara agree with what we know about the *Chedi* king Uparichara.[2]

Very little is known regarding the history of Kaliṅga from the death of Aśoka to the rise of the Cheta or Cheti dynasty probably in the first century B.C. (three hundred years after the Nandas) The names of the first two[3] kings of the Cheta line are not clearly indicated in the Hāthīgumphā Inscription. Lüders Ins No. 1347 mentions a king named Vakradeva (Vakadepasiri or Kūdepasiri?). But we do not know for certain whether he was a predecessor or successor of Khāravela.

During the rule of the second king, who must have reigned for at least 9 years (c. 37-28 B.C.), Khāravela occupied the position of Crown Prince (*Yuvarāja*). When he had completed his 24th year, he was anointed *Mahārāja* of Kaliṅga (c. 28 B.C.). His chief queen was the daughter of a prince named Lalāka, the great-grandson (according to some) of Hathisiṁha. In the first year of his reign he repaired the gates and ramparts of his capital, Kaliṅganagara. In the next year (c. 27 B.C.), without taking heed of Śātakarṇi, he sent a large army to the west and with its aid, having reached the Kṛishṇaveṇā, struck terror into the hearts of the people (or city) of Musika (Asika?)-

[1] No. 547.

[2] Rhys Davids, *Milinda*, SBE, XXXV, p 287; *Mbh.* I. 63, 14. According to Sten Konow (*Acta Orientalia*, Vol. I, 1923, p. 38) *Ceti* (not *Ceta*) is the designation of the dynasty of Khāravela occurring in the Hāthīgumphā Inscription.

[3] For *Purusha-Yuga* (generation) see Hemachandra, *Parišishta-parvan*, VIII, 326 *gāmī purusha-yugāni nava yāvattavānvayaḥ*.

nagara.[1] According to another interpretation, "he went to the rescue of Śātakarṇi and having returned with his purpose accomplished, he with his allies made gay the city." He followed up his success by further operations in the west and, in his fourth year, compelled the *Raṭhikas* and *Bhojakas* to do him homage. In the fifth year (c. 24 B.C.) he had an aqueduct, that had been opened out 300 years back by Nandarāja, conducted into his capital.

Emboldened by his successes in the Deccan the Kaliṅga king turned his attention to the North. In the eighth year he stormed Gorathagiri (Barābar Hills near Gayā) and harassed (the king of?) Rājagṛiha.[2] If Dr. Jayaswal is right in identifying this king with Bṛihaspatimitra, then king Bṛihaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kāṇva dynasty.

The attack on Northern India was repeated possibly in the tenth and certainly in the twelfth year. In the tenth year the Kaliṅga king, in the opinion of some scholars, overran countries in *Bhārat-varsha,* which are surmised to refer to those in Upper India. In the twelfth year he claims to have terrified or harassed the kings of *Uttarāpatha* and watered his elephants in the *Gaṅgā* (Ganges).[3] The north-western expeditions apparently led to no permanent result. But in north-eastern India the Kaliṅga king was more successful; the repeated blows certainly "struck terror into the Magadhas," and com-

[1] Cf. *Ep. Ind.* XX. 79, 87. Barua reads Aśvaka or Ṛṣika (*Old Brāhmi Ins.*, p. 176; Asika *IHQ*, 1938, 263). Dr. F. W. Thomas, too, finds in the passage no reference to a Musika capital (*JRAS*, 1922, 83). The alternative interpretation in the next sentence is his. *Cf.* Bühler, *Indian Palaeography,* 39.

[2] Some scholars find in line 8 of the Hāthīgumphā Ins. a reference to the *Yavana-raja (Di) ma (ta), i.e.,* Demetrios who "went off to Mathurā in order to relieve his generals who were in trouble" (*Acta Orientalia,* I. 27; *Cal. Rev.,* July, 1926, 153). But the reading is doubtful (cf. Barua, *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves,* pp. 17-18; *IHQ*, 1929, 594). Even if the reading *Dimata* be correct, the reference may be to Diyumeta or Diomedes (Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins,* p. 36) and not neces sarily to Demetrios

[3] Some scholars find here a reference to the *Sugaṁgīya* palace (*Ep. Ind*., xx. 88).

pelled the Magadha king (Bṛihaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet.

Having subjugated Magadha, and despoiled Aṅga, the invader once more turned his attention to Southern India. Already in his eleventh year "he had had Pithuḍa ploughed with a plough drawn by an ass."[1] Levi[2] identified this city with **Pihuṇḍa** of the *Uttarādhyayana* (21), and 'Pitundra metropolis' of Ptolemy in the interior of the country of Masulipatam (Maisoloi). The conqueror seems to have pushed further to the south and made his power felt even in the Tamil country by princes amongst whom the most eminent was the king of the Pāṇḍyas. In the thirteenth year Khāravela erected pillars on the Kumārī Hill (Udayagiri in Orissa) in the vicinity of the dwelling of the Arhats (Khaṇḍagiri?).

SECTION III. THE END OF GREEK RULE IN NORTH-WEST INDIA

While the remnant of the Magadhan monarchy was falling before the onslaughts of the Śātavāhanas and the Chetas, the Greek power in the North-West was also hastening towards dissolution. We have already referred to the feuds of Demetrios and Eukratides. The dissensions of these two princes led to a double succession, one derived from Demetrios holding for a time Kāpiśa and then Śākala (Śiālkoṭ) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Nicaea,[3] Takshaśilā and Pushkarāvatī as well as Kāpiśa (which was conquered from Apollodotos) and Bactria. According to Gardner and Rapson, Apollodotos, Anti-

[1] Barua interprets the passage differently But *cf* Nilakanta Sastri, *The Pandyan Kingdom*, p. 26

[2] *Ind. Ant*., 1926, 145 Sea-faring merchants are represented as going by boat from Champā to Pihuṇḍa in the days of Mahāvīra, the Jina. *Cf.* Mbh. I. 65. 67, 186, VII. 50.

[3] It lay on the Jhelum between that river and the Chenāb and was probably conquered by Heliokles in the reign of Strato I (*CHI*, 553, 699)

machos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, Agathokleia,[1] the Stratos, Menander, Dionysios, Zoilos,[2] Hippostratos and Apollophanes[3] probably belonged to the house of Euthydemos and Demetrios. Most of these sovereigns used similar coin-types,[4] specially the figure of the goddess Athene hurling the thunderbolt, which is characteristic of the Euthydemian line. Pantaleon and Agathokles strike coins with almost identical types.[5] They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the *Brāhmī* alphabet. They seem, therefore, to have been closely connected probably as brothers. It is not improbable that Agathokleia was their sister.[6] Agathokles (and possibly Antimachos) issued a series of coins[7] in commemoration of Alexander, Antiochos Nikator (Antiochos III

[1] According to some numismatics (*CHI*, 552) she was probably Menander's queen. But the theory has to explain why the 'evidence' regarding the supposed relationship is so *vague* (*contra* Heliokles and Laodike, Hermaios and Kalliope) *Cf* Whitehead in *Numismatic Chronicle*, Vol. XX (1940), p. 97. 1950, 216. Whitehead in JAOS, 1950, 216, throws doubt on the conjecture that Agathokles was the mother and not the *wife* of Strato I. In that case the theory of her marriage with Menander requires more convincing proof than that adduced by Rapson and Tarn.

[2] Apollodotos Philopator, Dionysios and Zoilos show a common and peculiar monogram struck probably by the same moneyer in one mint." Hoards of coins of these three princes have been found on the upper Sutlej. Coins of Zoilos have also been found at Pathankot and near Śākala (*JRAS*, 1913, 645nl; *JASB*, 1897, 8; Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 316f).

[3] Apollophanes shares a monogram with Zoilos and Strato (Tarn, *Greeks*, 317). Polyxenos, too, belongs to this group (p. 318). Whitehead considers him a close relation of Strato I (*Indo-Greek Coins*, 54n). The later kings of this group are connected with the Eastern Pañjāb (*EHI*, 4th ed., pp. 257-58). Tarn infers from a statement of Plutarch that after the death of Menander the eastern capital was shifted from Śākala to Bukephala (on the east bank of the Jhelum, Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Sources and Studies, 236).

[4] For an interesting account of Indo-Greek coin-types see H. K. Deb, IHQ, 1934, 509 ff.

[5] Dancing girl in oriental costume according to Whitehead; Māyā, mother of the Buddha, in the nativity scene according to Foucher (JRAS, 1919, p. 90). Tarn, *Greeks*, second edition, 527n. Deb finds mural crown; J. Banerji *yakshīs*.

[6] Agathokleia is also closely connected with the Stratos, being probably mother or queen of Strato I, and great (?) grandmother of Strato II of the JRNS, 1950, 216.

[7] According to Tarn (447f) the fictitious Seleukid pedigree is the key to the (pedigree) coin series of Agathokles, the Just.

Megas according to Malala), Diodotos Soter, Euthydemos and Demetrios Aniketos (the Invincible).

Apollodotos, the Stratos, Menander and some later kings used the Athene type of coins. Apollodotos and Menander are mentioned together in literature. The author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* says that "to the present day ancient *drachmae* are current in Barygaza (Broach) bearing inscriptions in Greek letters, and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apollodotos and Menander." Again, in the title of the lost forty-first book of Justin's work, Menander and Apollodotos are mentioned as Indian kings.[1] It appears from the *Milinda-pañho* that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Śākala or Sāgala.[2] We learn from Ptolemy, the Geographer, that the city had another name Euthymedia or Euthydemia, a designation which was probably derived from the Euthydemian line. An inscription on a steatite casket which comes from Shinkot in Bajaur territory refers to the 5th regnal year of *Mahārāja* Minadra (Menander). The record proves that in the 5th year of his reign the dominions of Menander probably included a considerable portion of the Trans-Indus territory. The Kāpiśa and Nicaea coins indicate how some of the rulers of the Euthydemian group were gradually pushed to the Indian interior. They had to remove their capital to Śākala.

To the rival **family of Eukratides** belonged Heliokles and probably Antialkidas who ruled conjointly with Lysias. A common type of Antialkidas is the Pilei of the Dioscuri, which seems to connect him with Eukratides; his portrait according to Gardner resembles that of

[1] Rhys Davids, *Milinda*, SBE, 35, p. xix. *Cf.* JASB, *Aug.*, 1833.

[2] "*Atthi Yonakānaṁ nānāpuṭabhedanam Sāgalannāma nagaram,*" "*Jambudīpe Sāgala nagare Milindo nāma Rājā ahosi.*" ."*Atthi kho Nāgasena Sāgalaṁ nāma nagaraṁ, tattha Milindo nāma Rājā rajjam kāreti.*" The form **Yonaka** *from which chronological conclusions have been drawn in recent times*, is comparable to *Madraka Vṛijika* (Pāṇini, IV. 2. 131). The form *Yona* is also found in the Post-Aśokan period (cf. the Besnagar inscription of Heliodoros). Doubts were raised by Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 2nd. ed., 538.

Heliokles. It is not improbable that he was an immediate successor of Heliokles.[1] A Besnagar Inscription makes him a contemporary of Kāsî (Kośî = Kautsī?) putra Bhāgabhadra of Vidiśā who ruled some time after Agnimitra probably in or about the latter half of the second century B.C. The capital of Antialkidas was probably at Takshaśilā or Taxila, the place from which his ambassador Heliodoros went to the kingdom of Bhāgabhadra. But his dominions seem also to have included Kāpiśi or Kāpiśa.[2] After his death the western Greek kingdom probably split up into three parts, *viz.*, Takshaśilā (ruled by the line represented by Archebios[3]), Pushkalāvatî (governed by Diomedes, Epander,[4] Philoxenos, Artemidoros, and Peukolaos), and Kāpiśi with the Kābul region held successively by Amyntas and Hermaeus (Hermaios). With Hermaios was associated his queen, Kalliope. Kāpiśa was, according to Chinese evidence, probably occupied by the Sai-wang (Śāka lord) some time in the latter part of the second century B.C. But the barbarian chieftain, like the Kushān *Yavuga* of later times, may have acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek *Basileas*, as Teutonic chieftains in Europe were, during the fifth century A.D., sometimes content with the rank of 'patrician' and 'consul,' under the nominal authority of the titular Roman emperor.

The Greek power must have been greatly weakened by the feuds of the rival lines of Demetrios and Eukratides. The evils of internal dissension were aggravated by foreign inroads. We learn from Strabo[5] that the **Parthians** deprived Eukratides (and the Scythians) by

[1] Gardner, *Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum*, p. xxxiv.

[2] *Camb. Hist.*, 558.

[3] A copper piece of this king is restruck, probably on a coin of Heliokles (Whitehead, p. 39).

[4] The 'Pallas and thunderbolt' type of his silver coins, probably connects him with the Śākala group, *ibid.*, 64. Among the rulers of the Gandhāra region we should perhaps also include Telephos whose coinage resembles that of Maues, *ibid.*, 80. A prince named Nikias apparently ruled in the Jhelum District (EHI, 4th ed., 258), and perhaps other tracts (*Num. Chron.*, 1940, p. 109). But the story of his naval victory over Maues is based on inadequate evidence.

[5] H. and F.'s Vol. II, pp. 251-253.

force of arms of a part of Bactriana, which embraced the satrapies of Aspionus and Turiva (possibly Aria and Arachosia according to Macdonald). There is reason to believe that the Parthian king Mithradates I penetrated even into India. Orosius, a Roman historian, who flourished about 400 A.D., makes a definite statement to the effect that Mithradates (c. B.C. 171-138) subdued the natives between the Hydaspes[1] and the Indus. His conquest thus appears to have driven a wedge between the kingdom of Eukratides and that of his rival of the house of Euthydemos.

The causes of the final downfall of the Bactrian Greeks are thus stated by Justin: "the Bactrians harassed by various wars lost not only their dominions but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians and the Indians (?) they were at last overcome as if exhausted by the weaker Parthians."[2]

The **Sogdians** were the people of the region now known as Samarkand and Bukhārā. They were separated from Bactriana by the Oxus and from the Śakas by the Jaxartes or the Syr Daria.[3] By the term Sogdian Justin probably refers not only to the Sogdiani proper but also to the well-known tribes which, according to Strabo,[4] deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, *viz.*, the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, Sacarauli and the Sacae or Śakas. The story of the Śaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Sarancae (Saraucae) and Asiani, who

[1] *In the Cambridge History of India*, Vol I. p. 568, however, this river has been identified with a Persian stream, the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil.

[2] Sten Konow translates the passage from Justin thus: The Bactriaps lost both their empire and their freedom, being harassed by the Sogdians (beyond the Oxus), the Arachoti (of the Argandāb valley of S. Afghanistan), the Drangae (lake-dwellers, near the Hamun Lake) and the Arei (of Herat), and finally oppressed by the Parthians (*Corpus*, ii 1, xxi-xxii).

[3] Strabo, XI 8. 8-9

[4] H. and F.'s Tr, Vol. II, pp. 245-46 *Cf.* JRAS, 1906, 193 f.; Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 171, Bachhofer, JAOS. 61 (1941), 245 (criticism of Tarn).

finally conquered Sogdiana and Bactria. The occupation of Sogdiana probably entitled them to the designation Sogdian used by Justin. Sten Konow[1] suggests the identification of the Tochari of the Classical writers with the Ta-hia[2] of the Chinese historians. He further identifies the Asii, Asioi or Asiani with the Yüe-chi. We are inclined to identify the Tochari with the **Tukhāras** who formed an important element of the Bactrian population in the time of Ptolemy and are described by that author as a great people.[3] They are apparently "the war-like nation of the Bactrians" of the time of the *Periplus*.

The **Drangians,** literally 'lake dwellers',[4] referred to by Justin, inhabited the country about the Hamun lake (*Zareh*) between Areia (Herat), Gedrosia (Baluchistān) and Arachosia (Kandahār) and the desert of Eastern Persia, close to and perhaps including at times within its political boundaries the neighbouring province now called Sīstān or Seistan (Śakasthāna)[5] Numismatic evidence indicates that a family whose territory lay mainly in southern Afghanisthān, *viz.*, the so-called **dynasty of Vonones,** supplanted Greek rule in a considerable part of the Helmund valley, Ghazni and Kandahār **(Arachosia).** Vonones is a Parthian (Imperial) name. Hence many scholars call his dynasty a Parthian family, and some go so far as to assert that this Vonones is the Arsakid king of that name who reigned from A.D. 8 to 14.[6] But names are not sure proofs of nationality. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar calls the dynasty Śaka.[7] The best name for the family would be

[1] *Modern Review*, April, 1921, p. 464. *Corpus*, II. 1, xxii, lvii f

[2] Tahia is apparently different from the "Dahae" of the classical writers which, says Macgovern, lay far to the west. According to Trogus the Asiani were the lords of the Tochari (*Reges Thocarorum Asiani*, JAOS, 61. 246ff; 65, 71ff).

[3] *Ind. Ant*, 1884, pp. 395-96.

[4] Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, 32.

[5] *Corpus*, xl, Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 92, MASI, 34. 7. Isidore, places Drangiana (Zarangiana) beyond Phra (Farah), and locates Śakasthāna beyond this territory (Schoff, 9). But Herzfeld points out that Sīstān is the Achaemenian 'Zrang'.

[6] *Camb. Short Hist.*, 69.

[7] Isidore of Charax who mentions the revolt of Tiridates against Phraates

Drangian, because the chief centre of their power probably lay in the Helmund valley, Arachosia being ruled by a viceroy.[1] On coins Vonones is associated with two princes, *viz.*,

(*i*) Śpalahora (Spalyris) who is called *Mahārājabhrātā* (the king's brother).

(*ii*) Śpalaga-dama, son of Śpalahora.

There is one coin which Edward Thomas and Cunningham attributed to Vonones and Azes I. But the coin really belongs to Maues.[2] There is a silver coin of a prince named Spalirises which bears on the obverse the legend *Basileus Adelphoy Spalirisoy*, and on the reverse "*Mahārāja bhrātā dhramiasa Spaliriśasa*," *i.e.*, of Spalirises the Just, brother of the king. This king has been identified by some with Vonones and by others with Maues.[3] Vonones was succeeded as supreme ruler by Spalirises.[4] The coins of Spalirises present two varieties, *viz.*,

1. Coins which bear his name alone in both the legends.

2. Coins on which his name occurs on the obverse

(26 B.C.) and is quoted by Pliny (Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, pp. 5, 13 ff, 17, JRAS, 1904, 706; 1906, 180, 1912, 990) refers (*Parthian Stations*, 9, para. 18, ZDMG, 1906, pp. 57-58; JRAS, 1915, p. 831; Tarn. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 53) to Sigal in Sacastene (near Kandahar?) as the royal residence of the Śakas (not Parthians) about the beginning of the Christian era. The names of the brother or brothers and nephew of Vonones (or Maues) ruling in southern Afghanistan seem to be Scythian (*cf.* Rapson quoted in *Corpus* II. i, xlii) Thus the local rulers of southern Afghanistan about B.C. 26 or a little later were probably Śakas. It is, however, possible that they acknowledged the supremacy of the great king of Parthia

[1] *Corpus*, xlii.

[2] Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Pañjāb Museum* (*Indo-Greek Coins*), p. 93. Num. Chron., JRNS (1950), p. 208n. Smith, *Catalogue*, 38. Bachhofer (JAOS, 61, 239) and Tarn possibly repeat the mistake (*Greeks*, 344n 2)

[3] Herzfeld identifies the royal brother of Spalirises with Maues (*Camb Short Hist.*, 69).

[4] It should be noted that certain coin-types of Spalirises are found restruck on coins of Vonones (CHI, 574) and on a copper coin of Spalyris and Śpalaga-dama (*Corpus*, II. i. xli). This proves that Spalirises was later than Vonones, Spalyris and Śpalagadama. The square Omicron on a coin of Spalyris probably points to a date not earlier than Orodes II (55 to 38/7 B.C.). Tarn, *Greeks*, 326.

in the Greek legend, and those of Azes on the reverse in the *Kharoshṭhī* legend.

The second variety proves that Spalirises had a colleague named Azes who governed a territory where the prevailing script was *Kharoshṭhī*. This Azes has been identified with king Azes of the Pañjāb about whom we shall speak in the next chapter.

As regards the Indian enemies of the Bactrian Greeks we must refer in the first place to the prince of the house of Pushyamitra who is represented in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitram* as defeating the Yavanas on the Sindhu. An Indian named Bhadrayaśas seems to have had some share in the destruction of the Greek kingdom of the Eastern Pañjāb. The Nāsik *praśasti* of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi represents that king as the destroyer of the Yavanas, apparently of Western India.

The final destruction of Greek rule was, as Justin says, the work of the Parthians. Marshall tells us[1] that the last surviving Greek principality,[2] that of Hermaios in the Kābul valley, was overthrown by the Parthian king Gondophernes.[3] The Chinese historian Fan-ye also refers to the Parthian occupation of Kābul.[4] "Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien-tchou (India Proper), Ki-pin (Kāpiśa) or Ngansi (Parthia), became powerful, it brought Kābul into subjection. When it grew weak it lost Kābul . . . . Later, Kābul fell under the rule of Parthia."[5]

[1] *A Guide to Taxila*, p. 14.

[2] Among the latest Greek rulers of the Kābul Valley we have to include Theodamas whose existence is disclosed by a Bajaur Seal Inscription (*Corpus*, II, i. xv, 6).

[3] In ASI, AR, 1929-30, pp. 56 ff., however, Marshall modifies his earlier views in regard to the conquest of the Greek kingdom of Kābul by the Parthians. He suggests that the Kābul Valley became a bone of contention between Parthians and Kushāns and changed bands more than once before the final eclipse of the Parthian power.

[4] JRAS, 1912, 676; *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. I, p. 81.

[5] *Cf.* Thomas JRAS, 1906, 194. For the results of India's contact with the Hellenic world in the domains of religion, administration, literature, science and art see Bhandarkar, "*Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population*" (*Ind Ant.*, 1911); Raychaudhuri, "*Early History of the Vaishṇava Sect, 1st ed.*"

The real conquest of Kābul by the Parthians could hardly have taken place till after the time of Isidore (last quarter of the first century B.C.)[1] because the writings of that geographer do not include the Kābul valley in the list of the eastern provinces of the Parthian Empire. By A.D. 43-44, however, Parthian rule had extended to this region as we learn from Philostratos.

p. 106, Foucher, "*The Beginnings of Buddhist Art,*" pp. 9, 111 f; Coomaraswami, "*History of Indian and Indonesian Art,*" pp. 41 f; Sten Konow, "*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,*" Vol. II, Pt. 1. xv; Hopkins, "*Religion of India,*" pp. 544 f; Keith, "*The Sanskrit Drama,*" pp. 57 f; Keith, "*A History of Sanskrit Literature,*" pp. 352 f.; Max Müller, "*India—What Can It Teach Us,*" pp. 321 f; Smith EHI,[4] pp. 251-56; "*A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon,*" Chap. XI; *Imp. Gaz., The Indian Empire,* Vol. II, pp. 105 f, 137 f, etc.

[1] Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India,* 53; Schoff *The Parthian Stations of Isidore of Charax,* 17.

CHAPTER VIII. SCYTHIAN RULE[1] IN NORTHERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE ŚAKAS

In the second and first centuries B.C., Greek rule in parts of Kāfiristān, Gandhāra and possibly the Hazāra country, was supplanted by that of the Śakas. In the days of Darius, the Achaemenid king of Persia (B.C. 522-486), the Śakas lived beyond Sogdiana (*para-Sugdam*) in "the vast plains of the Syr Darya, of which the modern capital is the town of Turkestan."[2] But already towards the end of the first century B.C. they were established at Sigal in modern Sīstān.[3] The story of their migration from central Asia has been recorded by Chinese historians. The *Annals of the First Han Dynasty* (*Ts'ien Han-Shu*) states "formerly when the Hiung-nū conquered the Ta-Yüe-tchi the latter emigrated to the west,[4] and subjugated the Tahia; whereupon the *Sai-wang* went to the south, and ruled over Kipin."[5] Sten Konow points out that the *Sai-wang* refer to the same people which are known in Indian tradition under the designation *Śaka-muruṇḍa*,[6] *Muruṇḍa* being a later form of a Śaka word which has the same meaning as Chinese "*wang*," *i.e.*, king, master, lord. In Indian inscriptions and coins it has frequently been translated with the Indian word *Svāmin*.

The name of the Śaka king who occupied Kipin is

[1] For the *Scythian Period*, see now a monograph by Johanna Engelberta von Lohuizen de Leeuw.

[2] E. Herzfeld, MASI, 34, 3.

[3] Schoff, Isidore, *Stathmoi Parthikoi*, 17

[4] C. 174-160 B.C. according to some scholars.

[5] JRAS, 1903, p 22; 1932. 958; *Modern Review*, April, 1921, p. 464. The Śaka occupation of Ki-pin must be posterior to the reign of Eukratides and his immediate (Greek) successors.

[6] Professor Hermann identifies the Sai-wang with the Sakarauloi or Sakaraukoi of Strabo and other classical authors. *Corpus*, II. 1, xxf. For Muruṇḍa see pp. xx.

not known. The earliest ruler of that region mentioned in Chinese records is Wu-t'ou-lao whose son was ousted by Yin-mo-fu, the son of the prince of Yung-k'ü,[1] with Chinese help. Yin-mo-fu established himself as king of Kipin during the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-ti, which lasted from 73 to 48 B.C., and killed the attendants of an envoy sent in the reign of the Emperor Yüan-ti (B.C. 48-33). In the reign of Chéng-ti (32-7 B.C.) the support of China was sought without success by the king of Kipin, probably the successor of Yin-mo-fu, who was in danger from some powerful adversary, apparently a king of the Yue-chi, who had relations with China about this time as is proved by the communication of certain Buddhist books to a Chinese official in 2 B.C.[2]

S. Lévi at first identified Kipin with Kaśmîra. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow[3] who accepts the identification with Kāpiśa.[4] Gandhāra was at one time the eastern part of the realm of Kipin. A passage of Hemachandra's *Abhidhāna-Chintāmaṇi* seems to suggest that the capital of the Sai-wang (*Śaka-Muraṇḍa*) was Lampāka or Laghman (*Lampākāstu Muraṇḍāḥ syuḥ*).[5] Sten Konow says that according to the *Ts'ien Han-shu*, or *Annals of the First Han Dynasty*, the Sai, *i.e.*, the Śakas, passed the *Hientu* (the hanging passage), *i.e.*, the gorge

[1] The identification of Yung-k'ü with Yonaka (Tarn, 297 and that of Yin-mo-fu with Hermaios (Tarn, 346) are purely conjectural. Mention may be made in this connection of Zonkah in Tibbat (JASB, 1895, 97) But the problem of identification must await future discoveries.

[2] *Cal Rev.*, Feb., 1924, pp 251, 252: Smith, EHI, 3rd ed., p 258n, JRAS, 1913, 647, Ind. Ant, 1905, *Kashgar and the Kharoshthī*

[3] Ep. Ind, XIV, p. 291.

[4] The country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kābul, *ibid.*, p 290: *cf* Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, Vol I, pp. 259-60. The city of Kāpiśi probably stood at the junction of the Ghorband and the Panjshir (Foucher, *Indian Studies presented to Prof. Rapson*, 343). Kipin according to the *Tsien Han-shu* joins Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia and Persia according to Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, 41) on the south-west. *Corpus*, II 1, xxiv, JRAS, 1912, 684n *Cf* Dr. Hermann (JRAS, 1913, 1058n.) who holds that Ki-pin was Gandhāra. The reference to a *gold* as well as a silver currency in Ki-pin is worthy of note (*Corpus*, II. 1, xxiv). *Cf* the gold coin of the city of Pushkalāvatī (*CHI*, 587), and the coin of Aṭhama (442 *infra*)

[5] Lampāka (Laghman) is 100 miles to the east of Kapisene (AGI, 49)

west of Skardu on their way to Kipin.[1] Though the Śakas wrested parts of Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) from the hands of Greek *meridarchs* (governors) they could not permanently subjugate Kābul,[2] where the *Basileus* (king) maintained a precarious existence. They were more successful in India. Inscriptions at Mathurā and Nāsik prove that the Śakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godāvari in the south, and destroyed the power of the 'Mitras' of Mathurā and the Śātavāhanas of Paiṭhan.[3]

No connected or detailed account of the Śaka potentates of Kipin is possible. Śakas are mentioned along with the Yavanas in the *Rāmāyaṇa*,[4] the *Mahābhārata*,[5] the *Manusaṁhitā*[6] and the *Mahābhāshya*.[7] The *Harivaṁśa*[8] informs us that they shaved one-half of their heads. The Jaina work *Kālakāchārya-kathānaka* states that their kings were called Śāhi.[9] Some of these 'Śāhis' are said to have been induced by a Jaina teacher to proceed to Suraṭṭha (Surāshṭra) *Vishaya* (country) and Ujjain in Hindukadeśa (India) where they overthrew some local chiefs and ruled for four years till they were themselves ousted by the founder of the era of 58 B.C.

The Śakas are also mentioned in the *Praśastis* of Gautamîputra Śātakarṇi and Samudra Gupta. Their kingdom or empire "*Śakasthāna*" is probably mentioned in the *Mahāmāyūrî* (95), in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription and in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of

[1] Ep. Ind., XIV, 291. *Corpus*, II. 1. xxiii. For possible alternative routes of conquest, see JRAS, 1913, 929, 959, 1008, 1023.

[2] *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Vol. I, p. 81.

[3] Some of the Śakas seem to have penetrated to the far south of India. A Nāgārjunikoṇḍa Inscription refers to a Śaka named Moda and his sister Budhi. Ep. Ind., xx, 37.

[4] I, 54. 22; IV. 43. 12

[5] II, 32. 17.

[6] X. 44.

[7] Ind Ant., 1875, 244.

[8] Chaps. 14, 16. JRAS, 1906, 204

[9] ZDMG, 34. pp. 247ff, 262; Ind. Ant., X, 222.

the Kadamba Mayūraśarman. The passage in the Mathurā inscription containing the word Śakasthāna runs thus:—

Sarvasa Sakastanasa puyae.

Cunningham and Bühler interpreted the passage as meaning "for the merit, or in honour, (of the people) of the whole of Sakasthāna." Dr. Fleet, however, maintained that "there are no real grounds for thinking that the Śakas ever figured as invaders of any part of northern India above Kāthiawāḍ and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the inscriptional passage referred to above as "a gift of Sarva in honour of his home."[1]

Fleet's objection is ineffective. Chinese evidence clearly establishes the presence of Śakas in Kipin, *i.e.*, Kāpiśa-Gandhāra.[2] As regards the presence of the tribe at Mathurā, the site of the inscription, we should note that the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*[3] refers to a Śaka settlement in the *Madhyadeśa.* Dr. Thomas[4] points out that the epigraphs on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Śaka and Persian nomenclature. The name Mevaki for instance, which occurs in the inscription, is a variant of the Scythian name Mauakes.[5] The termination "-*ūs*" in Komūsā and °Śamūśo seems to be Scythic. Dr. Thomas further points out that there is no difficulty in the expression of honour to the "whole realm of the Śakas" since we find in the Wardak, Sui Vihār and other inscriptions even more comprehensive expressions, *e.g.*, *Sarva*

[1] JRAS, 1904, 703f, 1905, 155, 643f; Mr N G Majumdar (JASB, 1924 17) takes Sakastana, to mean Śakrasthāna *i.e.* 'the place of Indra.' *Cf* Fleet in JRAS, 1904, 705.

[2] Note also the Kāpiśa types of the coins of Maues and Spalirises (*CHI.* 560n, 562, 591) and the foundation of a Kāpiśa satrapy (*Corpus*, II 1 150f.)

[3] Chapter 58

[4] Ep. Ind., IX, pp 138ff; JRAS, 1906, 207f, 215f

[5] Cf Maues, Moga, and Mavaces, the commander of the Śakas who went to the aid of Darius Codomannus (Chinnock, Arrian, p 142). *Cf.* also the coin-name Mevaku (S. Konow, *Corpus*, xxxiii n.) In the period 106 to 101 B.C. the king of Ferghana bore the Śaka name of Mu-ku'a (Tarn. *Greeks*, 308 f.)

sattvanam—'of all living creatures.' As regards Fleet's renderings "*svaka*" and "*sakaṭṭhāna,*" 'one's own place, Dr. Thomas says that it does not seem natural to inscribe on the stone, honour to somebody's own home. A *pūjā* addressed to a country is unusual, but inscription G of the Lion Capital contains a similar *pūjā* addressed to the chief representatives of the Śaka dominions.

Śakasthāna, doubtless, included the district of Scythia mentioned in the *Periplus,* "from which flows down the river Sinthus (Indus) the greatest of all the rivers that flow into the Erythraean Sea (Indian Ocean)." The metropolis of "Scythia" in the time of the *Periplus* was Minnagara; and its market town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Śaka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and Western India. According to Dr. Thomas "whatever Śaka dynasties may have existed in the Pañjāb or India, reached India neither through Āfghānistān nor through Kaśmīra but, as Cunningham contended, by way of Sindh and the valley of the Indus."[1] This theory cannot be accepted in its entirety in view of the inadequate representation of Sind by Śaka coins, the Chinese account of the Śaka occupation of Kipin and the epigraphic evidence regarding the existence of a Scythian Satrapy at Kāpiśi and a Śaka principality in the Hazāra country.[2] We cannot also overlook the fact that some of the Śaka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Śakas who lived near the Sogdianoi.[3] The names Maues, Moga[4] and Mevaki,[5]

[1] JRAS, 1906, p. 216.

[2] CHI, 569n. JASB, 1924, p. 14; S. Konow, *Corpus,* II. i. 13f. The Śaka conquest of Ki-pin did not mean the total extinction of the Greek principality in the Kābul region. *The History of the Later Han Dynasty* (A.D. 25-220) refers to the existence, side by side, of the kingdoms of Ki-pin and Kābul before the conquest of the latter state by the Parthians. Like the Śātavāhanas, the Greeks of the Kābul territory may have restored their fallen fortunes to a certain extent after the first rush of barbarian invasion had spent its force. It is also possible that Scythian chiefs for a time acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek *Basileus.*

[3] *Ind. Ant.,* 1884, pp. 399-400.

[4] Taxila plate.

[5] Mathurā Lion Capital.

for instance, are variants of the Śaka name Mauakes. We learn from Arrian that a chief named Mauakes or Movaces led the "Sacians (Śakas), a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwelt in Asia," who lived outside the jurisdiction of the Persian governor of the Bactrians and the Sogdianians, but were in alliance with the Persian king. Chhaharata, Khakharāta or Kshaharāta, the family designation of several satrapal houses of Taxila, Mathurā, Western India and the Deccan, is perhaps equivalent to **Karatai** the name of a Śaka tribe of the North.[1]

The Conquest of the Lower Indus Valley, Cutch and parts of Western India may, however, have been effected by the Śakas of Western Śakasthāna (Sîstān) who are mentioned by Isidore of Charax. The name of the capitals of "Scythia" (which embraced the Lower Indus Valley) and of the kingdom of Mambarus (Nambanus?) in the time of the *Periplus* was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Śakasthāna mentioned by Isidore.[2] Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the names of the Western Kshatrapas of Chashṭana's line, *viz.*, "Dāman" (*-dama*) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the *Kārddamaka* family from which, according to a Kanheri Inscription, the daughter of the *Mahākshatrapa* Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kārddama river in the realm of the Persians.[3]

The earliest Śaka kings mentioned in Indian inscrip-

[1] *Ind. Ant*, 1884, p 400, *cf. Corpus*, II, I. xxxvi: "Kharaosta and Maues would belong to the north-western Śakas of Ki-pin and not to the branch which came to India from Seistān." *Cf* xxxiii (case of Liaka).

[2] JRAS, 1915, p. 830.

[3] Shāmasastry's trans. of the *Arthaśāstra*, p. 86, n. 6. *cf.* Artemis (Ptolemy, 324). Gordomaris, Loeb, Marcellinus (ii, 389). For another view see Ind. Ant., XII. 273 n. The word *Kārdamika* occurs in the *Mahābhāshya* (IV. 2. 1. Word Index, p. 275); Kramadīśvara, 747; and Kardamila in Mbh. III. 135. 1. The Kārddama river may be identified with the Zarafshan which flowed through the old Achaemenian Satrapy of Bactria or Balkh. The *Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa* (Chs. 100 and 102) connects a line of Kārddama kings with Bāhlī or Bāhlika (IHK, 1933, pp. 37 ff).

tions are, perhaps, Damijada[1] and *Maues*. The latter is usually identified with Moga of the Taxila plate. He is possibly mentioned also in the Maira Inscription.[2] Maues Moga was a mighty sovereign (*Maharaya*). His dominions included Chuksha near Taxila which was ruled by a satrapal, *i.e.*, a viceregal, family. Numismatic evidence points to his sway over Kāpiśi[3] and Pushkarāvatī as well as Taxila.[4] His satrapas probably put an end to Greek and Indian rule in the country round Mathurā. In *parts* of the Eastern Pañjāb and certain adjacent tracts indigenous tribes like the Audumbaras, Trigartas, Kunindas, Yaudheyas, Ārjunāyanas had begun to assert their independence probably after the collapse of the Euthydemian monarchy. Maues struck coins with the types of Eukratides and Demetrios. But the absence of the *Athena Alkis* type leads Tarn to surmise that he did not annex Menander's home kingdom (*i.e.*, the district round Śākala).[5]

The dates assigned to Maues by various scholars range from B.C. 135 to A.D. 154. His coins are found ordinarily in the Pañjāb, and chiefly in the western portion of the province of which Taxila was the ancient capital. There can thus be no doubt that Maues was the king of Gandhāra. Now, it is impossible to find for Maues a place in the history of the Pañjāb before the Greek king Antialkidas who was reigning at Taxila when king Bhāgabhadra was on the throne of Vidiśā in Central India for fourteen years. The date of Bhāgabhadra is uncertain but he must be placed later than Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, who ruled from *cir.* B.C. 151 to 143. The fourteenth year of Bhāgabhadra, therefore, could not have fallen before *c.* 129 B.C. Consequently Antial-

[1] Or Namijada, Shahdaur Ins., *Corpus*, II. i. 14, 16.

[2] At Maira in the Salt Range, a *Kharoshṭhī* Inscription has been found in a well which seems to be dated in the year 58 and possibly contains the word *Moasa*, 'of Moa or Moga.'

[3] *Camb. Hist.* (Ind.), I. 590 f.

[4] *Ibid.*, 701.

[5] Tarn. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 322-330. The conquest of this kingdom may have been effected by Azes I. Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 112, Tarn, *GBI*, 349; or by Rājuvula, Allan *CICAI*, 185.

kidas could not have been ruling earlier than the second half of the second century B.C.,[1] and his reign could not have ended before 129 B.C. The Śaka occupation of Gandhāra must, therefore, be later than 129 B.C. All scholars except Fleet identify Maues with *Maharaya* Moga of the so-called Sirsukh or Taxila plate, dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Śaka institution. As the era is used *only* in Northern India and the borderland, it is permissible to conjecture that it came into existence after the Śaka occupation of those regions. We have already seen that this occupation could not have taken place before 129 B.C.[2] The era used in the Taxila plate could not, therefore, have originated before 129 B.C. The year 78 of the era could not have fallen before B.C. (129 – 78 =) 51. Consequently the rule of Maues-Moga cannot have ended before B.C. 51. He must be placed even later, because we learn from Chinese records that Yin-mo-fu was in possession of Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra about 48-33 B.C., and he was *preceded* by Wu-tou-lao and his son. As there is no real ground for identifying Maues-Moga with any of these rulers he will have to be placed after 33 B.C. He cannot perhaps be placed later than the middle of the first century A.D., because we learn from Philostratos and the author of the *Periplus* that about the time or a little later both Taxila and Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, *i.e.* the Śaka kingdom in the Indus valley, had passed into the hands of the Parthians. It seems, therefore, that Maues-Moga ruled after 33 B.C., but before the latter half of the first century A.D. According to Fleet, Moga flourished in the year 22 A.D.—the year 78 of the era commencing 58 B.C. which afterwards came to be known as the *Kṛita-Mālava-Vikrama* era. But the matter must be regarded as not definitely settled. The Khalatse Inscription of the year 187 (?) of Uvima (? Wema Kadphises) and the Taxila

[1] *Cf.*, now Marshall, *Monuments of Sāñchī*, I, 268n.

[2] Leeuw suggests that the era of the old Śaka inscriptions began from the Yue-chi conquest of Bactria *c.* 129 B.C.

Silver Vase Inscription of the year 191 of Jihonika possibly suggest that the era to which the dates of these inscriptions, and presumably that of the so-called Sirsukh (Taxilā) plate of Moga, are to be referred, began much earlier than B.C. 58.

Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of Gandhāra by **Azes** who put an end to the remnant of Greek rule in the Eastern Pañjāb by annexing the kingdom of Hippostratos. In the opinion of Marshall he also conquered the Jumnā valley where the Vikrama era was in use.[1] The coins of Azes are very closely related to the issues of the rulers of the Vonones group, and the assumption has always been made that Azes, the king of the Pañjāb, is identical with Azes, the colleague of Spalirises. Some scholars think that there were two kings of the name of Azes and that the first Azes was the immediate successor, not of Maues, but of Spalirises and that Maues came not only after Azes I, but also after Azes II. But the last part of the theory cannot be accepted in view of the synchronism of Gondophernes and Azes II proved by the fact that Aspavarman served as *Strategos*, i.e., general or governor, under both the monarchs.[2] As Gondophernes ruled in the year 103,[3] while Maues-Moga ruled in the year 78,[4] and as both these dates are *usually* referred by scholars to the same era, both Gondophernes and his contemporary Azes II must be later than Maues-Moga. There is no room for Maues-Moga between Azes I and Azes II, because we shall see presently that the succession from Azes I to Azes II is clearly established by numismatic evidence. Maues came either before Azes I or after Azes II; but we have already seen that he could not have reigned after Azes II. He must, therefore, be placed before Azes I. He may have been ruling in the Pañjāb when Vonones was ruling in Sīstān. When Vonones was

[1] *JRAS*, 1947, 22.
[2] Whitehead, *Catalogue of Coins in the Pañjāb Museum*, p. 150.
[3] *Cf.* the Takht-i-Bāhī Inscription.
[4] *Cf.* the Taxila Plate of Patika.

succeeded by Spalirises, Maues was succeeded by Azes I. We have already seen that Spalirises and Azes I issued joint coins.[1] The relationship between the two monarchs is not known. They may have been related by blood, or they may have been mere allies like Hermaios and Kujūla Kadphises.[2]

King Azes I struck some coins bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of **Azilises** in *Kharoshṭhī* on the reverse.[3] Then again we have another type of coins on which the name in Greek is Azilises, and in *Kharoshṭhī* is *Aya* (Azes). Drs. Bhandarkar and Smith postulate that these two joint types, when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes similarly was subsequently the subordi-

[1] Rapson on pp. 573-574 of *CHI*, identifies Azes, the colleague of Spalirises, with Azes II, and makes him the son of Spalirises. On page 572, however, the suggestion is found that Azes II was the son and successor of Azilises. It is difficult to see how the two views can be reconciled. For an inscription of Azes see *Corpus*, II. i. 17 (Shahdaur Inscription of Śivarakshita). The name of Aja or Aya (Azes) has also been recognised by certain scholars in the Kalawān Inscription of the year 134 and in the Taxila silver scroll record of the year 136. The absence of any honorific title before the name makes it difficult to say whether it refers to a king, and, if it does refer to a king, whether the ruler in question was Azes I or Azes II. Moreover, if Aja or Aya is a royal name, then it would seem, from the analogy of other *early* Indian epigraphs, that the years 134 and 136 actually belonged to his reign; not years of an era which he *founded* but of an era which he *used*. The absence of any honorific title has, however, led some writers to suggest that Aja-Aya was the *founder* of the reckoning mentioned in the epigraphs, and not the *reigning* sovereign in the years 134 and 136. The identity of the reckoning with the era of 58 B.C. cannot be regarded as certain, though the theory has many advocates. Another thorny problem is the relation between this reckoning and the reckoning or reckonings used by Moga and Gondophernes. For the Kalawān Inscription see *Ep. Ind.* XXI. 251 ff.; *IHQ*, 1932, 825; 1933, 141; India in 1932-33, p. 182.

[2] *Cf.* Whitehead, p. 178; Marshall, *Taxila*, p. 16.

[3] Coins of Azilises are imitated by Mahādeva Dharaghosha Audumbara (*CHI*, 529). Along with certain caskets discovered in Taxila (*ASI, AR*, 1934-35, pp. 29, 30) was a silver coin of the *dioskouri* type of Azilises and a Roman coin issued by Augustus. The deposit was probably made early in the first century A.D. We have here new data for settling the chronology of the Maues-Azes group of kings. It may be remembered that Kadphises I copied the bust of Augustus or one of his immediate successors on his coins. Azilises should not be far removed in date from the Julian Emperors or from the period of Kushān invasion.

nate colleague of Azilises. The two princes named Azes cannot, therefore, be identical, and they must be distinguished as Azes I and **Azes II.** Whitehead, however, observes that the silver coins of Azilises are better executed and earlier in style than those of Azes. The best *didrachms* of Azes compare unfavourably with the fine silver coins of Azilises with Zeus obverse and Dioskouroi reverse, and with other rare silver types of Azilises. If Azilises preceded Azes, then following Dr. Smith we must have Azilises I and Azilises II, instead of Azes I and Azes II. In conclusion Whitehead says that the differences in type and style between the abundant issues of Azes can be adequately explained by reasons of locality alone, operating through a long reign.[1] Marshall, however, points out that the stratification of coins at Taxila clearly proves the correctness of Smith's theory, according to which Azes I was succeeded by Azilises, and Azilises by Azes II.[2]

A notable discovery has unearthed the unique *gold* coin of a king named **Athama.** Whitehead has no hesitation in recognising him as a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. His date is, however, uncertain.

Unlike most of the Indo-Greek princes,[3] the Śaka kings style themselves on their coins *Basileus Basileon,* corresponding to the *Prākrit* on the reverse *Mahārājasa Rājarājasa.* They also appropriate the epithet *Mahatasa,* corresponding to the Greek *Megaloy,* which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title *Rājarāja*—king of

[1] Inferior workmanship according to some, is a sign of remoteness (from Gandhāra?) rather than of late date (cf. *CHI*, 569f). G. Hoffmann and Sten Konow not only reject the duplication of Azes, but suggest the identification of Azes with Azilises. According to Marshall Azilises ruled north-westwards as far as Kāpiśi (*JRAS*, 1947, 25 ff).

[2] The coins which Smith assigns to Azes II are found *generally* nearer the surface than those of Azes I (*JRAS*, 1914, 979). For Konow's view, see *Ep. Ind.*, 1926, 274 and *Corpus*, II. i. xxxix-xl. The name 'Azes' is found in association with several rulers of various dates, while that of Azilises is found only with one (*viz.*, Azes). This possibly points to the plurality of the kings named Azes.

[3] With the exception perhaps of Eukratides one of whose coins bears the legend *Maharajasa rajatirajasa* Evukratidasa (*Corpus*, II. i. xxix n), and of a few other rulers including Hermaios (Whitehead, p. 85).

kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the viceroys (*satraps*) Liaka and Patika of Chuksha (Chach) in the Western Punjab. One of the kings named Azes had under him at least one subordinate ruler, *e.g.*, the *Stratagos* Aspavarman. The title *Satrap* or *Kshatrapa* occurs in the Behistun Inscription of Persia in the form *Khshathrapāvan* which means 'protector of the kingdom.'[1] "*Strategos*," a Greek word, means a general. It is obvious that the Scythians continued in North-Western India the Perso-Hellenic system of government by *Satraps* and military governors. Coins and Inscriptions prove the existence of several other Satrapal families besides those mentioned above.

The **North Indian Kshatrapas** or Satraps may be divided into three main groups, *viz.*: —

1. The Satraps of Kāpiśi, Puspapura and Abhisāraprastha,
2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjāb, and
3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

A Māṇikiālā inscription affords the bare mention of a **Satrap of Kāpiśi** who was the son of the Satrap Granavhryaka.[2] A Kābul Museum Stone Inscription of the year 83[3] discloses the name of a Satrap of Puspapura named Tiravharṇa. 'Puspapura', the city of flowers, may have reference to Pushkarāvatī (lotus-city). The name of Śivasena, 'the *Kshatrapa* in the town of Abhisāraprastha' occurs in the legend of a copper seal ring found in the Pañjāb.[4] The territory of the three Satraps may have corresponded to Yona, Gandhāra and Kamboja of Aśokan epigraphs.

[1] *Cf. Ksha-pāvan* of the *Rig-veda* (*Vedic Index*, 1. 208). *Rāshṭra-pāla* of the *Arthaśāstra* and *Goptṛi* or *Deśa-goptṛi* of the *Mālavikāgnimitram* and the Gupta inscriptions.

[2] Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, ci; *Ancient India*, 141; *JASB*, 1924, 14, *Corpus*, II. i, 150-1.

[3] *Acta Orientalia*, xvi, Pars iii, 1937, pp. 234 ff.

[4] *Corpus*, II. i. 103.

The **Pañjāb Satraps** belonged to three families, *viz.*—

(*a*) The **Kusulua** or **Kusuluka Group**—It consisted of Liaka and his son Patika, possibly of the Chhaharata or Kshaharāta family, who apparently governed the district of Chuksha.[1] According to Fleet there were two Patikas.[2] But in the opinion of Marshall there was only one viceroy of the name of Patika.[3] The Satrapal line of Kusuluka was intimately connected with the Satraps of Mathurā.[4] The coins of Liaka Kusuluka show the transition of the district to which they belonged, *i.e.*, a part of Eastern Gandhāra, from the rule of the Greek house of Eukratides to the Śakas.[5] We learn from the Taxila, or the so-called Sirsukh plate, dated in the year 78, that Liaka was a Satrap of the great king Moga and that Patika, his son, was a great gift-lord (*mahādānapati*).[6]

(*b*) **Manigul** and his son **Zeionises** or **Jihonika**—Numismatists consider them to be Satraps of Pushkalāvatî during the reign of Azes II. But the Taxila Silver Vase Inscription of the year 191 discovered by Marshall in 1927[7] shows that Jihonika was a *Kshatrapa* in Cukhsha near Taxila in the year 191 of an era of Śaka (or Parthian ?) institution whose exact epoch is not known.[8] The successor of Zeionises was apparently Kuyula Kara.[9]

(*c*) **The House of Indravarman**[10]—It consisted of

[1] Buhler, *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 54; Konow, *Corpus*, II. i. 25-28. Chuksha, according to Stein, is the present Chach in the north of the District of Attock. See also *AGI*², 63, 126. The Charsadda Inscriptions of the year 303 refers to a grāmasvāmin and satrap (of Chukhsa?) named Avakhajhāda (Konow, *Acta Orientalia*, XX, p. 108ff).

[2] *JARS*, 1907, p. 1035. The existence of at least two Liakas is, however, proved by the Taxila plate and the Zeda inscription (*Corpus*. II. i. 145). A Lia(ka) appears also to be mentioned in the Mānsehrā inscription of the year 68. He may have been identical with the father of Patika, *Ep. Ind.* XXI, 257.

[3] *JRAS*, 1914. pp. 979 ff.

[4] *Cf.* Inscription G on the Mathurā Lion Capital.

[5] Rapson's *Ancient India*, p. 154.

[6] *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 257; *JRAS*, 1932, 953n.

[7] *JRAS*, 1928, January, 137 f. *Corpus*, II. i. 81 f.

[8] *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 255f.

[9] *CHI*, 582n, 588.

[10] Indravarman has been identified by some scholars with Itravarma, son of Vijayamitra, who is known from certain coins. Vijayamitra is further

Indravarman, his son Aspavarman, and Aspa's nephew Sasa(s) or Sasa(n). Aspavarman acted as governor of both Azes II and Gondophernes, while Sasa(s) served under Gondophernes and Pakores.

The Satraps of Mathurā

The earliest of this line of princes were once believed to be the rulers Hagāna and Hagāmasha. They were supposed to be succeeded by Rājuvula, who may have governed Śākala at an earlier stage According to Allan[1] he established himself in Mathurā late in life. The genealogical table of the house of Rājuvula or Rājula as arranged by Sten Konow[2] is given below in a foot-note.

Rājuvula or Rājula is known from inscriptions as well as coins. An inscription in *Brāhmî* characters at Mora near Mathurā calls him a *Mahākshatrapa* or Great Satrap (viceroy). But the Greek legend on some of his coins describes him as "king of kings, the Saviour" showing that he probably declared his independence.

Rājuvula was apparently succeeded by his son Śuḍasa, Soṁdāsa or **Śoḍāsa.** Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a *Kshatrava* (Satrap) and as the

regarded as identical with, or a successor of, Viyakamitra, a feudatory of Minedra **(Menander).** The importance of these identifications, in determining the chronological relation of the Indo-Greeks and the Śakas, is obvious. (Majumder, *Ep Ind*, xxiv, 1 ff, Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, 102 ff; *Ep. Ind.* xxvi, 321; Mookerji, *CI*, XIV, 4, 1948, 205 f. Also Whitehead. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1944, pp. 19-104. *Apacharaja* of the Bajaur inscription is taken by some to mean 'ruler of the West'

[1] *CIC*, *AI*, CXV.

[2] *Corpus* II. i. 47.

son of the *Mahākshatrava* Rajula (Rājuvula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in *Brāhmī* characters call him a *Mahākshatrapa*. One of these inscriptions gives a date for him in the year 72[1] of an unspecified era. It is clear that during his father's lifetime he was only a *Satrap*. But on his father's death some time before the year 72, he became a Great Satrap. Sten Konow adduces grounds for believing that Śoḍāsa dated his inscription in the so-called *Vikrama* era.[2] Consequently the year 72, in his opinion, possibly corresponds to A.D. 15.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar refers the dates of the Northern Satraps (of Taxila and Mathurā) to the *Śaka* era, and places them in the middle of the second century A.D. But Ptolemy, who flourished about that time, places neither Taxila nor Mathurā within Indo-Scythia, *i.e.*, the Śaka dominion. This shows that neither Taxila nor Mathurā was a Śaka possession in the second century A.D. The principal Indo-Scythian possessions in Ptolemy's time were Patalene (the Indus Delta), Abiria (the Ābhira country in Western India), and Syrastrene (Kāthiāwāḍ).[3] This is exactly what we find in the Junāgaḍh inscription of the Śaka ruler Rudradāman I, who flourished in the middle of the second century A.D. In Ptolemy's time Taxila was included within the Arsa (*Sanskrit Uraśā*) territory,[4] and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi.[5] Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Śaka empire of Maues and his successors (which included Taxila, Mathurā and Ujjayinî) under the name of 'Kaspeiraioi'.[6] But we

The genealogy, as reconstructed by Sten Konow, is not accepted by many scholars. An older view makes Kharaosta the son of a daughter of Rājuvula. For Rājuvula's connection with C. Pañjāb, see Allan, *CCAI*, 185. Cf. 438 *ante*.

[1] 42 according to Rapson. But 72 is preferred by most scholars.

[2] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 139-141.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 354

[4] *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 348.

[5] *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 350.

[6] *Journal of the Department of Letters*, University of Calcutta, Vol. I, p. 98 n.

should remember that far from including Taxila, Mathurā and Western India within one empire, Ptolemy sharply distinguishes the land of the Kaspeiraioi from Indo-Scythia which was the real Śaka domain in the middle of the second century A.D.[1] Moreover, the territory of the Kaspeiraioi must have included the region below the sources of the Jhelum Chenab and the Ravi, *i.e.*, Kaśmīra and its neighbourhood;[2] and there is no evidence that the dynasty of Maues ever ruled in Kaśmīra. It was only under the kings of Kanishka's dynasty that Kaśmira and Mathurā formed parts of one and the same empire. As suggested by the Abbé Boyer the Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy evidently referred to the Kushān empire.

We learn from the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscriptions that when Sudasa, *i.e.* Śoḍāsa, was ruling as a mere *Kshatrapa*, Kusuluka Patika was a *Mahākshatrapa*. As Śoḍāsa was a Mahākshatrapa in the year 72, he must have been a Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Kusuluka Patika must have been reigning as a *Mahākshatrapa* contemporary of the *Kshatrapa* Śoḍāsa *before* the year 72. The Taxila plate of the year 78, however, does not style Patika as a *Kshatrapa* or *Mahākshatrapa*. It calls him *Mahādānabati* (great gift-lord) and gives the satrapal title to his father Liaka.[3] Dr. Fleet thinks[4] that we have to do with two different Patikas. Marshall and Sten Konow on the other hand, hold the view that the *Mahādānapati* Patika, who issued the Taxila plate, is identical with the *Mahākshatrapa Kusuluka* Patika of the Mathurā Lion Capital, but the era in which the inscription of *Sam* 72 is dated, is not the same as in the Taxila plate of *Sam* 78. In other words

[1] *Cf.* Ptolemy, *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 354, and the Junāgaḍh Inscription of the Śaka ruler Rudradāman.

[2] Land of Kaśyapa? *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 1, 27. IA. IV, 227. Stein accepts the identification of the territory of the Kaspeiraioi with Kaśmir, but rejects Wilson's assumption that Kaśmir was *derived* from Kaśyapa Pura (*JASB*, 1899, Extra 2, pp. 9-13). The evidence of Ptolemy seems to suggest that the city of Kaspeira stood close to Multan. Alberunī (I. 298) in a later age mentions Kaśyapapura as a name of Multan itself.

[3] Sten Konow, *Corpus*, Vol. II, Pt. I, 28, *Ep. Ind.*, XIX, 257.

[4] *JRAS*, 1913, 1001n.

while Fleet duplicates kings, Marshall and Sten Konow duplicate eras. It is difficult to come tò any final decision from the scanty data at our disposal. Fleet's theory is not improbable in view of the fact that we have evidence regarding the existence of at least two Liakas. But the duplication of kings is not absolutely necessary as the designation '*mahādānapati*' given to Patika in the Taxila plate does not preclude the possibility of his having been a *Mahākshatrapa* as well a few years back. We should remember in this connection that there are instances among the Western Kshatrapas of Chashṭana's line, of *Mahākshatrapas* being reduced to a humbler rank[1] while other members of the family held the higher office,[2] and of a *Kshatrapa* (Jayadāman) being mentioned without the satrapal title.[3] It is, therefore, not altogether improbable that the inscription of *Sam* 72 and that of *Sam* 78 are dated in the same era, and yet the two Patikas are identical.[4] If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aja-Aya (Azes) in the Kalawān Copper-plate Inscription of the year 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, we have additional instances of a ruler of this age being mentioned without any title indicative of his rank.

Kharaosta was, according to S. Konow, the father-in-law, and according to Fleet, a grandson (daughter's son), of Rājuvula and consequently a nephew of Śoḍāsa.[5] The inscriptions A and E on the Mathurā Lion Capital mention him as the *Yuvaraya* Kharaosta. Sten Know thinks[6] that he was the inheritor to the position as "king of kings"

[1] *Cf.* Majumdar, *The Date of Kanishka*, *Ind. Ant.*, 1917.

[2] Rapson, *Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, etc. cxxivf

[3] Andhau Inscriptions.

[4] The *Rājataraṅgini* furnishes an instance of a son being replaced by his father as king (*cf.* the case of Pārtha), and of a king abdicating in favour of his son and again resuming control over the kingdom; *cf.* the case of Kalasa who continued to be a co-ruler after the resumption of control by his father, and that of Rājā Mānsingh of Jodhpur (1804-43). The cases of Vijayāditya VII (*Eastern Chalukya*, D. C. Ganguli, p. 104 and of Zāfar Khān of Gujarāt may also be cited in this connection (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, III, 295).

[5] JRAS, 1913, 919, 1009

[6] *Corpus*, 36.

after Moga. His known coins are of two types, presenting legends in Greek characters on the obverse and in *Kharoshṭhī* on the reverse. The *Kharoshṭhī* legend runs thus: *Kshatrapasa pra Kharaostasa Arṭasa putrasa. 'Pra'* according to Sten Konow, may be a reflex of *Prachakshasa*.[1]

The coins of the family of Rājuvula are imitated from those of the Stratos and also of a line of Hindu princes who ruled at Mathurā. This shows that in the Jumna valley Scythian rule superseded that of both Greek and Hindu princes.

A fragmentary inscription found by Vogel on the site of Gaṇeshrā near Mathurā revealed the name of Satrap of the Kshaharāta family called Ghaṭāka.[2]

The Nationality of the Northern Satraps

Cunningham held that the inscription P on the Mathurā Lion Capital—*Sarvasa Sakastanasa puyae*—gave decisive proof that Rājuvula or Rājula, Śoḍāsa and other connected Satraps were of Śaka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Śaka domination. This is strongly supported *a priori* by the fact that Patika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Śaka. The inscriptions on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Śaka nomenclature.[3] Attention may, however, be called here to the fact that in the *Harivaṁśa* there is a passage[4] which characterises the Pahlavas or Parthians as "*śmaśrudhāriṇaḥ*" (bearded).[5]

[1] *Corpus*, xxxv. '*prachakshasa*' (=epiphanous, " of the gloriously manifest one"), occurs on coins of Strato I and Polyxanos. It is, however, possible that the Sanskrit equivalent of the name of the Satrap is *prakhara-ojas*, "of burning effulgence."

[2] JRAS, 1912, p. 121.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IX, pp. 138 ff; JRAS, 1906, 215f For Sten Konow's views see *Corpus*, II. 1. xxxvii.

[4] I. 14, 17.

[5] The passage is also found in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Ch. 88, 141.

Judged by this test, kings of the family of Rājuvula and Nahapāna, who are not unofen taken to be Parthians, could not have belonged to that nationality as their portraits found on coins[4] show no traces of beards and whiskers. They were, therefore, almost certainly Śakas.

SECTION II. THE PAHLAVAS OR PARTHIANS[1]

Already, in the time of Eukratides, Mithradates I, King of Parthia (*c.* 171-138/37 B.C.), had probably conquered portions of the Pañjāb or Sind, and in the days of the Śaka Emperors of the family of Maues-Moga, princes of mixed Śaka-Pahlava origin ruled as Satraps in Northern India. But it is important to note that Isidore of Charax, possibly a younger contemporary of Augustus, who wrote not earlier than 26 B.C. (reign of Phraates IV and the revolt of Tiridates) and is quoted by Pliny, does not include the Kābul Valley, Sind or the Western Pañjāb within the empire of the Parthians or Pahlavas. The easternmost provinces of the Parthian empire mentioned by that writer are Herat (Aria), Farah (the country of the Anauoi, a segment of Aria (*i.e.*, the Herat Province), the districts between the Lake Hamun and the Helmund (Drangiana and Sakasthāna), and Kandahār (Arachosia or "White India"). Towards the middle of the first century A.D., however, Śaka sovereignty in parts of Gandhāra must have been supplanted by that of the Parthians. In 43-44 A.D., when Apollonios of Tyana is reputed to have visited Taxila, the throne was occupied by Phraotes, evidently a Parthian.[2] He was however independent of Vardanes, the great King of Babylon and Parthia (*c.* 39-

[1] The Parthians (Pārthava, Pahlava) were an Irānian people established on the borders of the district that is today Mazandarān and Khurāsān. About 249/8 B.C. they revolted against the Seleukids under the command of Arshaka (Arsaces), a leader of *Scythia* (Pope and Ackerman, *A Survey of Persian Art*, p 71).

[2] *Aprathata* (Gondophernes) according to Herzfeld and Tarn (*Greeks*, 341).

47/48 A.D.,[1] and himself powerful enough to exercise suzerain power over the "Satrap of the Indus." Christian writers refer to a king of India named Gundaphar or Gūdnaphar and his brother Gad who are said to have been converted by the Apostle St. Thomas and who, therefore lived in the first century A.D.[2] We have no independent confirmation of the story of the biographer of Apollonios. But the "so-called" Takht-i-Bāhī record of the year 103 (of an unspecified era) shows that there was actually in the Peshāwar district a king named **Guduvhara (Gondophernes).** The names of Gondophernes and, in the opinion of some scholars, of his brother Gad, are also found on coins.[3] According to Rapson the two brothers were associated as sub-kings under the suzerainty of Orthagnes (Verethragna). Sten Konow, however, identifies Orthagnes with Guduvhara himself, while Herzfeld suggests that he was the "unnamed son of Vardanes, mentioned by Tacitus, who claimed the throne against Volagases I about A.D. 55."[4] Dr. Fleet referred the date of the Takht-i-Bahaī (Bāhī) inscription to the Mālava-Vikrama era, and so placed the record in A.D. 47.[5] He remarked "there should be no hesitation about referring the year 103 to the established Vikrama era of B.C. 58; instead of having recourse, as in other cases too, to some otherwise unknown era beginning at about the same time. This places Gondophernes in A.D. 47 which suits exactly the Christian tradition

[1] Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, 270.

[2] The original Syriac text of the legend of St. Thomas belongs probably to the third century A.D. (*JRAS*, 1913, 634). Cf. *Ind. Ant.*, 3. 309.

[3] Whitehead, pp 95, 155. Gondophernes=Vindapharna, "Winner of glory" (Whitehead, p. 146, Rapson and Allan). The king assumed the title of Devavrata. S. Konow, following Fleet, takes the word Guḍana on the coins to refer to the *tribe* of Gondophernes (*Corpus*, II. i. xlvi).

[4] *Corpus*, xlvi; *The Cambridge Shorter History of India*, 70

[5] *JRAS*, 1905. pp. 223-235; 1906, pp. 706-710; 1907, pp. 169-172, 1013-1040; 1913, pp. 999-1003. *Cf.* the views of Cunningham and Dowson (*IA*, 4. 307). The discovery of the Khalatse and the Taxila silver vase inscriptions, however, makes the theory of Fleet less plausible unless we believe in the existence of a plurality of Śaka-Pahlava eras. Dr. Jayaswal was inclined to place Gondophernes in 20 B.C. But this date is too early to suit the Christian tradition.

which makes him a contemporary of St. Thomas, the Apostle."

The power of Gondophernes did not probably in the beginning extend to the Gandhāra region. His rule seems to have been restricted at first to Southern Afghanistan.[1] He succeeded, however, in annexing the Peshāwar district before the twenty-sixth year of his reign. There is no *epigraphic* evidence that he conquered Eastern Gandhāra (Taxila) though he certainly wrested some provinces from the Azes family. The story of the supersession of the rule of Azes II by him in one of the Scythian provinces is told by the coins of Aspavarman. The latter at first acknowledged the suzerainty of Azes (II) but later on obeyed Gondophernes as his overlord. Evidence of the ousting of Śaka rule by the Parthians in the Lower Indus Valley is furnished by the author of the *Periplus* in whose time (about 60 to 80 A.D.) Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, *i.e.*, the Śaka kingdom in the Lower Indus Valley, was subject to Parthian princes who were constantly driving each other out. If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aja-Aya or Azes in the Kalawān Inscription of 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, then it is possible that Śaka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra,[2] while Peshāwar and the Lower Indus Valley passed into the hands of the Parthians. But the absence of an honorific title before the name of Aja-Aya and the fact that in the record of the year 136 we have reference to the establishment of relics of the Buddha in Takshaśilā "for the bestowal of health on the *Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra* Khushaṇa," probably suggest that the

[1] *JRAS*, 1913, 1003, 1010.

[2] For Fleet's interpretation of "*Sa 136 ayasa ashaḍasa masasa, etc.*" see *JRAS*, 1914, 995ff; also *Calcutta Review*, 1922, December, 493-494. S. Konow thought at one time that *ayasa* stood for *ādyasya* (=the first). He took the word as qualifying *ashaḍasa*. But he changed his views after the discovery of the Kalawān Inscription of 134. He now thinks that the addition *ayasa, ajasa* does not characterize the era as instituted by Azes, but simply as 'connected with Parthian rulers' (*Ep. Ind.*, xxi. 255f). He refers the dates 134, 136 to the era of 58 B.C.

years 134 and 136 belong, not to the *pravardhamāna-vijayarājya* (the increasing and victorious reign) of Azes, but to a period when his reign was a thing of the past (*atītarājya*), though the reckoning was still associated with his honoured name. The dating in the Jānībighā inscription (*Lakshmaṇa-senasy = ātītarājye* saṁ 83) possibly furnishes us with a parallel.[1]

The Greek principality in the Upper Kābul Valley had apparently ceased to exist when Apollonios travelled in India. We learn from Justin that the Parthians gave the *coup de grace* to the rule of the Bactrian Greeks. Marshall says[2] that the Kābul valley became a bone of contention between the Parthians and the Kushāns. This is quite in accordance with the evidence of Philostratos who refers to the perpetual quarrel of the "barbarians" with the Parthian king of the Indian borderland in 43-44 A.D.

With Gondophernes were associated as subordinate rulers his nephew Abdagases (in S. Afghanistān), his generals Aspavarman and Sasa(s) or Sasa(n), and his governors Sapedana and Satavastra (probably of Taxila).

After the death of the great Parthian monarch his empire split up into smaller principalities. One of these (probably Sīstan) was ruled by Sanabares, another (probably embracing Kandahār and the Western Pañjāb) by Pakores, and others by princes whose coins Marshall recovered for the first time at Taxila. Among them was Sasa(s) or Sasa(n) who acknowledged the nominal sway of Pakores. The internecine strife among these Parthian princelings is probably reflected in the following passage of the *Periplus*:—

"Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small island and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."

Epigraphic (and in some cases numismatic) evidence proves that the Pahlava or Parthian rule in Afghanistān,

[1] Raychaudhuri, *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 165f.
[2] *ASI, AR*, 1929-30, 56ff.

the Pañjāb and Sind was supplanted by that of the Kushaṇa, Gushaṇa, Khushaṇa or **Kushān**[1] dynasty. We know that Gondophernes was ruling in Peshāwar in the year 103 (A.D. 47 according to Fleet, somewhat earlier according to others). But we learn from the Panjtar inscription that in the year 122 the sovereignty of the region had passed to a Gushaṇa or Kushān king.[2] In the year 136 the Kushān suzerainty had extended to Taxila. An inscription of that year mentions the interment of some relics of the Buddha in a chapel at Taxila "for bestowal of perfect health upon the *Mahārāja, rājātirāja devaputra* Khushana." The Sui Vihār and Mahenjo Daro Kharoshṭhī Inscriptions prove the Kushān conquest of the Lower Indus Valley. The Chinese writer Pan-ku, who died in A.D. 92, refers to the Yueh-chi occupation of Kao-fou or Kābul. This shows that the race to which the Kushāns belonged took possession of Kābul before A.D. 92. It is, no doubt, asserted by a later writer that Kao-fou is a mistake for Tou-mi. But the mistake in Kennedy's opinion would not have been possible, had the Yueh-chi not been in possession of Kao-fou in the time of Pan-ku.[3] The important thing to remember is that a Chinese writer of 92 A.D., thought Kao-fou to have been a Yueh-chi possession long before his time. If Sten Konow is to be believed, the Kushāns had established some sort of connection with the Indian borderland as early as the time of Gondophernes. In line 5 of the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription Sten Know reads "*erjhuṇa Kapasa puyae*,"[4]

[1] For a note on the dynastic nomenclature, see R. Schafer, *JAOS*, 67. 4. p. 296ff; *cf. AOS*, 65. 71ff.

[2] We learn from Philostratos that already in the time of Apollonios (A.D. 43-44) the barbarians (Kushāns?) who lived on the border of the Parthian kingdom of Taxila were perpetually quarrelling with Phraotes and making raids into his territories (*The Life of Apollonius*, Loeb Classical Library, pp. 183ff).

[3] *JRAS*, 1912, pp. 676-678. Note also Pan-ku's reference to a man's head on the coins of Ki-pin (*JRAS*, 1921, p. 685n) which possibly suggests an acquaintance with the coinage of Kuyula Kaphsa (or Kasa?).

[4] *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 294; XVIII (1926), p. 282. *Corpus*, II, i. 62. Some regard this "Kapa" as a phantom. It is interesting to recall in this connection a statement of Philostratos (*The life of Apollonius of Tyana*, Loeb Classical

"in honour of prince Kapa," *i.e.*, Kujūla Kadphises, the Kushān king, who is said to have succeeded Hermaios in the Kābul valley. Kujūla Kadphises has been identified with the Kuei-shuang (Kushān) prince K'iu-tsiu-k'io who took possession of Kao-fou (Kābul) Po-ta and Ki-pin. It appears from numismatic evidence that this Kushān chief[1] was possibly an ally of Hermaios with whom he appears to have issued joint coins.[2] Kadphises seems also to have been at first on friendly terms with the Parthian rulers of Gandhāra. But the destruction of Hermaios' kingdom by the parthians[3] probably supplied him with a *casus belli*. He made war on the latter and eventually destroyed their power in the north-west borderland of India.

Section III. The Great Kushāns

We are informed by the Chinese historians that the Kushāns (chiefs of the Kuei-shuang or Kouei-chouang principality) were a section of the Yueh-chi[4] (Yüe-chi) race The modern Chinese pronunciation of the name according to Kingsmill is said to be Yué-ti. M. Lévi and other French scholars write Yue-tchi or Yué-tchi.

We learn from Ssū-ma-ch'ien (the Chinese annalist,

Library, p. 185) that in A.D. 43-44, the Parthian king of Taxila had enlisted the services of certain "barbarians" to patrol his country so that instead of invading his dominions they themselves kept off the "barbarians" that were on the other side of the frontier and were difficult people to deal with. Prince "Kapa" (if the reading and interpretation be correct) may have been at first one of these friendly barbarian chiefs. His date is indicated by his (?) imitation of a Roman emperor's head of a style not later than about A.D 60 (JRAS, 1913, 918).

[1] Or one of his ancestors? *Cf.* Tarn, *The Greeks*, pp. 339, 343.

[2] Pedigree coins according to Tarn.

[3] Before the Parthian conquest, Kāpiśi apparently had to obey, for a time, the rule of Maues and Spalirises (*CHI*, 590 f.). The Kushāns, the "barbarian" enemies of "Phraotes", may have had a hand in the restoration of Greek rule before its final disappearance in the Kābul valley.

[4] The periods of Yue-chi migration have been discussed by several scholars. The first period of march from Kanshu to the Upper Li, c. 172-161 B.C. Second stage from the Upper Li to the Oxus between 133-129 B.C. The third period began with the conquest of Bactria (c. 129 B.C.) Leeuw, *The Scythian Period*, pp. 31-33.

who recorded the story of the travels of Chang-k'ien, the famous envoy), that between B.C. 174 and 165 the Yueh-chi were dwelling between the Tsenn-hoang (Tun-huang) country and the K'i-lien mountains, or Tien-chan Range, south and east of Lake Issykul in Chinese Turkestan.[1] At that date the Yueh-chi were defeated and expelled from their country by the Hiung-nū who slew their king and made a drinking vessel out of his skull. The widow of the slain ruler succeeded to her husband's power. Under her guidance the Yueh-chi in the course of their westward migration attacked the Wu-sun whose king was killed.[2] After this exploit the Yueh-chi attacked the Śakas on the upper Ili and in the plains of the Jaxartes or the Syr Darya and compelled their king or 'lord' to seek refuge in Kipin (Kāpiśa-Lampāka-Gandhāra).[3]

Meantime the son of the slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and, with the assistance of the Hiung-nū drove the Yueh-chi further west into the Ta-hia territory washed by the Oxus. The Ta-hia, who were devoted to commerce, unskilled in war and wanting in cohesion, were easily reduced to a condition of vassalage by the Yueh-chi who established their capital or royal encampment to the north of the Oxus (Wei), in the territory now belonging to Bukhārā (in ancient Sogdiana). The Yueh-chi capital was still in the same position when visited by Chang-kien in or about B.C. 128-26.[4]

The adventures of Chang-k'ien as related by Ssū-ma-ch'ien in the *Sse-ke* or *Shi-ki* (completed before B.C. 91)

[1] Smith says (EHI[4], p. 263) that they occupied land in the Kansuh Province in North-Western China. See also *CHI*, 565, Halfen, *J. Am. Or Soc.*, 65, pp. 71 ff. For the Hiung-nū-Hun Problem, *cf.* Stein, IA, 1905, 73 f, 84.

[2] The main section of the Yueh-chi passed on westwards beyond Lake Issykkūl, the rest diverged to the South and settled on the frontier of Tibet. The latter came to be known as the "Little Yueh-chi". Eventually they established their capital at Purushapura in Gandhāra. Smith, EHI[4], 264; S. Konow, *Corpus*, II, i. lxxvi.

[3] A part of the Śaka horde apparently seized Ferghana (Ta Yuan) c. 128 B.C. (Tarn, *Greeks*, 278 n. 4, 279).

[4] *JRAS*, 1903, pp. 19-20; 1912, pp. 668 ff.; *PAOS*, 1917, pp. 89 ff.; Whitehead, 171; *CHI*, 459, 566, 701; Tarn, *Greeks*, 84, 274 n, 277; S. Konow, *Corpus* II. i. xxii-xxiii, liv, lxii.

were retold in Pan-ku's *Ts'ien Han-shu* or *Annals of the First Han Dynasty* that dealt with the period B.C. 206—A.D. 9 or 24, and was completed by Pan-ku's sister after his death in A.D. 92, with three important additions, namely: —

1. That the kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi had for its capital the town of Kien-chi (Kien-she), to the north of the Oxus,[1] and Kipin lay on its southern frontier.

2. That the Yueh chi were no longer nomads.

3. That the Yueh-chi kingdom had become divided into five principalities, *viz.*, Hi (eo)u-mi (possibly Wakhān[2] between the Pamirs and the Hindukush), Chouangmi or Shuang-mi (Chitral, south of Wakhān and the Hindukush) Kouei-chouang or Kuei-shuang, the Kushān principality, probably situated between Chitral and the Panjshir country, Hit(h)um (Parwān on the Panjshir) and Kao-fou (Kābul).[3]

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yueh-chi in Fan-Ye's *Hou Han-shu* or *Annals of the Later Han Dynasty* which cover the period between A.D. 25 and 220. Fan-Ye based his account on the report of Pan-young (*cir.* A.D. 125) and others.[4] He himself died in 445 A.D. The capital of the Yueh-chi was then probably the old Ta-hia (Bactrian) city of Lan-shi, variant Ch'in-shi[5], to the north of the Oxus.

[1] Cf. *Corpus*, II i. liv

[2] A *Bakanapati*, apparently lord of Wakhān, figures in the inscription of *Mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra Kushānaputra Shāhi* Vamataksha(ma?) whose identity is uncertain. The title *devaputra* connects him with the Kanishka Group of Kushān kings, and not the Kadphises Group. *ASI*, 1911-12, Pt. I. 15; 1930-34. Pt. 2. 288

[3] A later historian regards Kao-fou as a mistake for Tou-mi which, however, was probably not far from Kābul, *JRAS*, 1912, 669. For the proposed identifications see *Corpus*, II. i. lvi. Cf *JRAS*, 1903, 21; 1912, 669. In *Ep. Ind.*, XXI. 258, S Konow suggests the identification of Kuei-shuang with Gandhāra or the country immediately to its north.

[4] *Cf.* S. Konow, *Corpus*, liv: "It is accordingly the events of the period A.D. 25-125 which are narrated by Fan-Ye, though there are some additions referring to a somewhat later time in the case of countries which were near enough to remain in contact with China after the reign of emperor Ngan" (107-25). See also *Ep. Ind.*, XXI. 258.

[5] Alexandria = Zariaspa or Bactria (Tarn, *Greeks*, 115, 298). *JAOS*, 61 (1941), 242 n.

Fan-Ye gives the following account of the Yueh-chi conquest:

"In old days the Yue-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nū. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five *Hsi-h(e)ou* or *Yabgous*,[1] *viz.*, those of Hsiumi, Shuangmi, Kuei-shuang, Hsitun and Tumi. More than hundred years after that, the *hsi-hou* or *Yabgou* (*Yavuga*) of Kuei-shuang (Kushān) named K'iu-tsiu-k'io attacked and annihilated the four other *hsi-hou* and made himself king or lord (*Wang*); he invaded Ngan-si (the Arsakid territory, *i.e.*, *Parthia*) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fou (Kābul), overcame Po-ta[2] and Ki-pin and became complete master of these kingdoms. K'iu-tsiu-k'io died at the age of more than eighty. His son Yen-kao-tchen succeeded him as king. In his turn he conquered T'ien-tchou (lit. 'India,' on the banks of a great river, apparently the kingdom of Taxila referred to by Philostratos), and established there a chief for governing it. From this time the Yue-chi became extremely powerful. All the other countries designated them Kushān after their king, but the Han retained the old name, and called them Ta-Yue-chi."

"K'iu-tsiu-k'io" has been identified with **Kujula**[3] **Kadphises (I)**,[4] or Kozola Kadaphes, the first Kushān king who struck coins to the south of the Hindukush. Numismatic evidence suggests that he was the colleague or ally,[5] and afterwards the successor, of Hermaios, the last Greek

[1] According to one view the five hsi-hou existed already in Ta-hia when the Yueh-chi invaded Bactria (*JAOS*, 65. 72 f.).

[2] Perhaps identical with the country of Po-tai which, in the time of Sung-yun, sent two young lions to the King of Gandhāra as present (Beal, *Records of the Western World*, Vol. I, ci). S. Konow (*Ep. Ind.*, XVIII) identified P'u-ta with Ghazni, but later on (*Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 258) suggested its identification with Butkhāk, ten miles east of Kābul.

[3] Cf. *Kusuluka*. The expression probably means 'strong' or beautiful (S. Konow, *Corpus*, l). According to Burrow (*The Language of the Kharoshṭhī Documents*, 82, 87) *Kujula*=Guśura=Vazir. Dr. Thomas (possibly) thinks that the word *Kujula* has the sense of 'Saviour'.

[4] Pahlavi *Kad*=chief+*pises* or *pes*=form, shape, *JRAS*, 1913, 632 n.

[5] Fleet and Thomas, *JRAS*, 1913, 967, 1034; in the opinion of some scholars Hermaios was dead at the time of the Kushān conquest. Coins bear-

prince of the Kābul valley. The former view that Kadphises conquered Hermaios is, in the opinion of Marshall, wrong. Sten Konow finds his name mentioned in the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription of the year 103 belonging to the reign of Gondophernes.[1] The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushān and Parthian rulers were on friendly terms. But the Parthian attack on the kingdom of Hermaios apparently led to a rupture which ended in war. The result was that the Parthians were ousted by Kadphises I.

Marshall identifies Kadphises I with the Kushān king of the Panjtar record (of the year 122) and the Taxila scroll of the year 136.[2] We should, however, remember that in the Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushān king is called *Devaputra*, a title which was characteristic of the Kanishka group and *not* of Kadphises I or II unless we identify Kadphises I with Kuyula Kara Kaphsa.[3] The monogram on the scroll is by no means characteristic only of coins of the Kadphises group, but it is also found, in Marshall's and S. Konow's opinion, on the coins of Zeionises and Kuyula Kara Kaphsa. If, however, S. Konow and Marshall are right in reading the name of Uvima Kavthisa in the Khalatse inscription of the year 184 or 187, and in identifying him with Vima Kadphises, the king of the Panjtar and Taxila records of 122 and 136 may have been a predecessor of Wema (Vima), and should preferably be identified with Kadphises I. But the reading 'Uvima

ing his name continued, according to this view, to be struck long after he had passed away. Tarn regards the Hermaios-Kadphises coins as "pedigree coins". His view is not accepted by Bachhofer (JAOS, 61. 240 n). Supporters of the 'alliance' theory may point to the gold dollars circulating in Chungking engraved with relief portraits of Marshal Chiang Kaishek and President Roosevelt of the United States (*A. B. Patrika*, 29-3-1945).

[1] The interpretation of S. Konow is not accepted by Professor Rapson, *JRAS*, 1930, p. 189.

[2] JRAS, 1914, pp. 977-78, Rapson, *CHI*, 582, identifies the Kushān king of 136 with Vima (*i.e.*, Kadphises II).

[3] Mentioned by R. D. Banerji, *Prāchīna Mudrā*, p. 85. I cannot vouch for the correctness of the reading.

Kavthisa' and his identification with Kadphises II are by no means certain.

Kadphises I probably coined no gold but only copper. His coinage shows unmistakable influence of Rome.[1] He copied the issues of Augustus or those of his immediate successors preferably Claudius (A.D. 41-54),[2] and used the titles *Yavuga* (chief), *Mahārāja*, *Rājātirāja* (the great king, the king of kings) and "*Sachadhrama thita*", "Steadfast in the True Faith" (of the Buddha?).[3]

"K'iu-tsiu-k'io," or Kadphises I, was succeeded by his son **Yen-kao-tchen,** the Vima, Wima or Wema Kadphises of the coins, who is usually designated as **Kadphises II.** We have already seen that he conquered Tien-tchou or the Indian interior, probably Taxila, and set up a chief who governed in the name of the Yueh-chi. According to Sten Konow[4] and Smith[5] it was Kadphises II who established the Śaka Era of A.D. 78. If this view be accepted then he was possibly the overlord of Nahapāna, and was the Kushān monarch who was defeated by the Chinese between A.D. 73 and 102 and compelled to pay tribute to the emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). But there is no direct evidence that Kadphises II established any era. No inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an *era* of *his* institution. On the contrary we have evidence that Kanishka did establish an

[1] In one class of his copper coins appears a Roman head which was palpably imitated from that of Augustus (B C 27-A.D. 14), Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), or Claudius (A.D. 41-54). *JRAS*, 1912, 679; 1913, 912; Smith, *Catalogue*, 66; *Camb. Short Hist.*, 74. Rome and its people, Romakas, first appear in the *Mahābhārata* (II. 51, 17) and occur not unfrequently in later literature. Diplomatic relations between Rome and India were established as early as the time of Augustus who received an embassy from king 'Pandion' (*JRAS*, 1860, 309 ff. *Camb. Hist Ind.* I. 597) about B.C. 27 20. An Indian embassy was also received by Trajan (A.D. 98-117) shortly after A.D. 99. Strabo, Pliny and the *Periplus* refer to a brisk trade between India and the Roman Empire in the first century A.D. See *JRAS*, 1904, 591; *IA*, 5, 281; 1923, 50. Pliny deplores the drain of specie (*JRAS*, 1912, 986, 1913, 641-1031).

[2] *The Cambridge Shorter History*, 74, 75.

[3] Smith, *Catalogue*, 67 n.; S. Konow, *Corpus*, II. i. lxiv f.; Whitehead, 181.

[4] *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 141.

[5] *The Oxford History of India*, p. 128.

era, that is to say, his method of dating was continued by his successors, and we have dates ranging probably from the year 1 to 99.[1]

The conquests of the Kadphises kings opened up the path of commerce between China and the Roman Empire and India. Roman gold began to pour into this country in payment for silk, spice and gems. Kadphises II began to issue gold coins.[2] He had a bilingual gold and copper coinage.[3] The obverse design gives us a new lifelike representation of the monarch. The reverse is confined to the worship of Śiva, which was gaining ground since the days of the *Śiva-Bhāgavatas* mentioned by Patañjali.[4] In the *Kharoshṭhī* inscription Kadphises II is called "the great king, the king of kings, lord of the whole world, the *Mahīśvara*, the defender."[5]

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the *Wei-lio*[6] which was composed between A.D. 239-265 and covers the period of the Wei down to the reign of the emperor Ming (227-239),[7] that the Yueh-chi power was flourishing in Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra), Ta-hia (Oxus valley), Kao-fou (Kābul) and Tien-tchou (India) as late as the second quarter of the third century A.D. But the early Chinese annalists are silent about the names of the successors of Yen-kao-tchen (Kadphises II). Chinese sources, however, refer to a king of the Ta-Yueh-chi named Po-tiao or Puā-d'ieu (possibly Vāsudeva) who sent an embassy to the

[1] For criticism of the "Omitted hundreds theory," see *JRAS*, 1913, 980 f.

[2] A gold coin of Wima or Vima (*NC*, 1934, 232), gives him the title *Basileus Basilewn Soter Megas* (Tarn, *Greeks*, 354 n. 5). This throws welcome light on the problem of the identification of the *nameless king* Soter Megas.

[3] A silver piece resembling the ordinary small copper type of Vima Kadphises is also known (Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 174). Other silver coins of the monarch are apparently referred to by Marshall (*Guide to Taxila*, 1918, 81). A silver coin of Kanishka is also known (*ASI, AR*, 1925-26, pl. lxf). Smith (*EHI*[4], p. 270) and others make mention of silver coins of Huvishka.

[4] V. 2. 76; *cf.* Śaiva, Pāṇini, IV. 1. 112.

[5] As already stated Sten Konow finds the name of Vima (Uvima) Kavthisa (Kadphises?) in the Khalatse (Ladakh) inscription of the year 187(?). *Corpus*, II. i. 81. The identity of the King in question is, however, uncertain.

[6] *A History of the Wei Dynasty* (A.D. 220-264).

[7] *Corpus*, II, i. lv.

Chinese emperor in the year 230.[1] Inscriptions discovered in India have preserved the names with dates of the following great Kushān sovereigns besides the Kadphises group, *viz.*, **Kanishka I** (1-23),[2] Vāsishka (24-28),[3] Huvishka (28-60),[4] Kanishka II, son of Vā-jheshka (41), and Vāsudeva (67-98).[5] Huvishka, Vā-jheshka and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhaṇa as Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who apparently ruled conjointly. It will be seen that Kanishka II ruled in the year 41, a date which falls within the reign of Huvishka (28-60). Thus the account of Kalhaṇa is confirmed by epigraphic evidence.

In the chronological order generally accepted by numismatists, the Kanishka group succeeded the Kadphises group. But this view is not accepted by many scholars. Moreover, there is little agreement even among scholars who place the Kanishka group after the Kadphises kings. The more important theories of Kanishka's date are given below:

1. According to Dr. Fleet, Kanishka reigned *before* the Kadphises group, and was the founder of that reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat.[6] This view (held at one

[1] *Corpus*, II, i. lxxvii.

[2] See *JRAS*, 1913, 980; 1924, p. 400. *"Three Mathurā Inscriptions and their bearing on the Kushān Dynasty"* by Dayārām Sahni; and *IHQ*, Vol. II (1927), p. 853, *"Further Kanishka Notes"* by Sten Konow. *Ep. Ind.*, XXIV. 210.

[3] If Vāsishka be identical with Vas Kushāṇa of a Sāñchī epigraph, his reign (as sub-king) commenced not later than the year 22 as we learn from an inscription of that year on the pedestal of an image of the Buddha (*Pro. of the Seventh Session of the I. H. Congress*, Madras, p. 135).

[4] See *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 55 ff.—*Mathurā Brāhmī Inscription of the Year 28*. *Cf. Ep. Ind.*, xxiii 35—*Hidda Inscription* of 28.

[5] *Hyd. Hist. Cong.*, 164.

[6] For discussions about the origin of the so-called *Vikrama* era see *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 637, 994 ff.; Kielhorn in *Ind. Ant.* xx. (1891), 124 ff.; 397 ff.; *Bhand, Com. Vol.*, pp. 187 ff. *CHI*, pp. 168, 533, 571; *ZDMG*, 1922, pp. 250 ff. *Ep. Ind.* xxiii. 48 ff., xxvi. 119 ff.; Kielhorn (and now Altekar) adduce evidence which seems to show that the early use of the era, as may be inferred from records with dates that may be recognised to refer to this reckoning, was mainly confined to Southern and Eastern Rājputāna, Central India and the Upper Ganges Valley. The name of the era found in the earliest inscriptions recalls designations like that of king KṚITA of Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, III. 19.

time by Cunningham and Dowson, and maintained by Franke) was accepted by Kennedy, but was ably controverted by Dr. Thomas, and can no longer be upheld after the discoveries of Marshall.[1] Inscriptions, coins as well as the testimony of Hiuen Tsang clearly prove that Kanishka's dominions included Gandhāra, but we have already seen that according to Chinese evidence Yin-mo-fu, and not the Kushāns, ruled Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) in the second half of the first century B.C. Allan thinks that "the gold coinage of Kanishka was suggested by the Roman *solidus*" and that the Kushān monarch can hardly

Kritiya rulers are mentioned by Fleet, *JRAS*, 1913, 998n. Kṛita may also have reference to the inauguration of a Golden Age after a period of toil and moil From the fifth to the ninth century the reckoning was believed to be used especially by the princes and people of **Malava.** The connection of the name **Vikrama** with the era grew up gradually and was far from being *generally* adopted even in the ninth century A.D. The phraseology employed in the poems and inscriptions of the next centuries shows a gradual advance from the simple *Samvat* to *Vikrama Samvat*, *Śrinripa Vikrama Samvat* and so on. The change in nomenclature was probably brought about by the princes and people of Gujarāṭ whose hostility to the Mālavas is well known. The Sātavāhanas could not have founded this or any other era because they always used regnal years, and Indian literature distinguishes between *Vikrama* and *Sālivāhana*. As to the claims of Azes, see *Calcutta Review*, 1922, December, pp. 493-494. Fleet points out (*JRAS*, 1914, 995 ff.) that even when the name of a real king stands before the statement of the years, so that the translation would be "in the year of such and such a king" he is not necessarily to be regarded as the actual *founder* of that particular reckoning. The nomenclature of an era, current in a comparatively late period, more than a century after its commencement, is no proof of origins. Therefore, the use of the terms *Ayasa* or *Ajasa* in connection with the dates 134 and 136 of the Kalawan and Taxila inscriptions, does not prove that Azes was the *founder* of the particular reckoning used His name may have been connected with the reckoning by later generations in the same way as the name of the Valabhi family came to be associated with the Gupta era, that of Śātavāhana with the Śaka era, and that of Vikrama with the "Kṛita"-Mālava reckoning itself which commenced in 58 B.C. Regarding the claims of Vikrama see *Bhand. Com. Vol.* and *Ind. Ant.*, cited above The *Purāṇas* while mentioning Gardabhilla are silent about Vikramāditya. Jaina tradition places Vikramāditya after 'Nahavāhana', or 'Nahapāna'. Regarding the contention of Fleet that the Vikrama era is a *northern* reckoning attention may be invited to the observations of Kielhorn and to a note on *Chola-Pāṇḍya Institutions* contributed by Professor C. S. Srinivasachari to *The Young Men of India*, July, 1926. The Professor points out that the era was used in Madura in the 5th century A.D. Kielhorn proves conclusively that the area where the era of 58 B.C. was used in the earliest times did not include the extreme north-west of India.

[1] Thomas, *JRAS*, 1913; Marshall, *JRAS*, 1914.

be placed before Titus (79-81 A.D.) and Trajan (98-117 A.D.).[1]

2. According to Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and several other scholars Kanishka's rule began about 125 or 144 A.D.,[2] and ended in the second half of the second century A.D.[3] Now, we learn from the Sui Vihār inscription that Kanishka's dominions included a portion at least of the Lower Indus Valley. Again we learn from the Junāgaḍh inscription of Rudradāman that the *Mahākshatrapa's* conquests extended to Sindhu and Sauvīra (which included Multān according to the Purāṇas and Alberuni) and even to the land of the Yaudheyas in the direction of the Sutlej. Rudradāman certainly flourished from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. He did not owe his position as *Mahākshatrapa* to anybody else (*svayam adhigata Mahākshatrapa nāma*).[4] If Kanishka reigned in the middle of the second century A.D., how are we to reconcile his mastery over the Sui Vihār region in the Lower Indus Valley with the contemporary sovereignty of Rudradāman?[5] Again Kanishka's dates 1-23, Vāsishka's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 28-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 67-98, suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era ever current in, or

[1] *Camb Short History*, p. 77.

[2] Recently Ghirshman suggested the period A.D. 144-72 for Kanishka (*Begram, Recherches Archaeologique et Historiques sur les Kouchans*). The argument that India was still in A.D. 125 governed by a Viceroy (and therefore, not by Kanishka or Huvishka) is effectively disposed of by Thomas in *JRAS*, 1913, 1024. He points out that the historian of the Later Han is obviously referring to the conditions at the time of the invasion of Wima Kadphises, and not to the state of things in A.D. 125.

[3] Dr. Sten Konow's views are difficult to ascertain. In the *Indian Studies in honour of C. R. Lanman* (Harvard University Press), p. 65, he mentions A.D. 134 as the initial point of the Kanishka reckoning which he and Dr. Van Wijk "have tried to establish" (*cf. Acta Orientalia*, III, 54 ff.). But in *IHQ*, III (1927), p. 851, he, along with Dr. Van Wijk, shows a predilection for A.D. 128-29 (*cf. Corpus*, lxxvii; *Acta Orientalia*, V, 168 ff.). Professor Rapson (in *JRAS*, 1930, 186 ff.) points out the conjectural and inconclusive character of the two Doctors' calculations. "The year 79", says he "seems to be out of the running and a dark horse, the year 128-9, is the favourite."

[4] *Ep. Ind.*, VIII. 44.

[5] See *IHQ*, March, 1930, 149.

known to, North-West India, which commenced in the second century A.D.

3. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thought that the era founded by Kanishka was the Traikuṭaka-Kalachuri-Chedi era of 248 A.D.[1] Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil points out that this is not possible.[2] "In fact, the reign of Vāsudeva, the last of the Kushāns, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vāsudeva reigned at Mathurā. It is certain that this country, over which extended the empire of Vāsudeva, was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nāgas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudragupta. The capitals of the Nāgas were Mathurā, Kāntipura and Padmāvatī." The Kushān (?) realm in the Indian borderland was, in A.D. 360, ruled by Grumbates[3]. The theory of Dr. Majumdar cannot, moreover, be reconciled with the Tibetan tradition which makes Kanishka a contemporary of king Vijayakīrti of Khotan,[4] and the Indian tradition which makes Huvishka a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, and hence of a king of the Imperial Śātavāhana line, who can hardly be placed later than the second century A.D., as he is described as 'lord of the three seas' and sovereign of (South) Kośala (in the Upper Deccan).[5] Lastly, the catalogues of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* state that An-Shih-Kāo (148-170 A.D.) translated the *Mārgabhūmi Sūtra* of Saṅgharaksha who was the chaplain of Kanishka.[6] This shows conclusively that Kanishka flourished before 170

[1] For this era see *JRAS*, 1905, pp. 566-68.

[2] *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 31.

[3] *EHI*[4], p. 290. The Chionitai identified by Cunningham with Kushāns.

[4] *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 142.

[5] *Rājataraṅginī*, I. 173; *Harsha-charita* (Cowell), p. 252; Watters, *Yuan-Chwang*, II, p. 200. The epithet *trisamudrādhipati* which the *Harsha-charita* (Book VIII) applies to the Śātavāhana friend of Nāgārjuna cannot fail to remind one of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi 'whose chargers drank the water of the three oceans' (*tisamudatoyapitavāhana*), or one of his immediate successors.

[6] Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, II, p. 64n. Bunyiu Nanjio's *Catalogue*, App. II, 4.

A.D.[1] The arguments against the theory of Dr. Majumdar are equally applicable to the surmise of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who placed Kanishka's accession in A.D. 278.

4. According to Fergusson, Oldenberg, Thomas, Banerji, Rapson, J. E. Van Lohuizen-De Leeuw, Bachhofer[2] and many other scholars Kanishka was the founder of that reckoning commencing A.D. 78, which came to be known as the *Śaka* era.[3] This view is not accepted by Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil on the following grounds:—

(*a*) If we admit that Kujūla-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kanishka founded the Śaka era in 78 A.D. we have scarcely 28 years for the duration of the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the whole of the reign of Kadphises II.

(But the date, A.D. 50, for Kadphises I is uncertain.

[1] According to the theory of Dr. Majumdar, Vāsudeva I ruled from (249+74) 323 to (249+98) 347 A.D. But Chinese evidence places a Po-t'iao (Vāsudeva?) in 230 A.D. The Khalatse Ins. also presents difficulties.

[2] Bachhofer JAOS, 61, 242.

[3] For the origin of the *Śaka* era see Fleet, *CII*, preface 56; *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 635, 650, 987 ff.; Dubreuil, *AHD*, 26; Rapson *Āndhra Coins*, p. cv; S. Konow, *Corpus*, II. i. xvi f. Nahapāna, who was not even a *Mahākshatrapa* in the years 42-45, and who never became a paramount sovereign, could not possibly have been the founder of the era. The theory which represents Nahapāna as the founder of the era used in his inscriptions (dated 42-46) is also contradicted by a Jaina tradition (relied on by Sten Konow, *Corpus*, II. i. xxxviii) which assigns to him (Nahavāhana) a period of only 40 years. Chashṭana has no better claims and the evidence of the *Periplus* shows that he could not have ruled at Ujjain in 78 A.D. As to the theory that Kadphises II founded the reckoning in question, it may be pointed out that no inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution. The only Scythian king who did establish an era in the sense that he used a regnal reckoning that was continued by his successors, is Kanishka. And the only reckoning that is attributed by Indian writers, since the days of the early Chalukyas, to a Scythian king is the Śaka era of 78 A.D.

Regarding the objection that the Śaka era was foreign to the north it may be pointed out that the era of 58 B.C., was equally foreign to the extreme north-west of India. The assertion that the Śaka era was never used in the north-west simply begs the question. It assumes what it has got to prove, *viz.*, that the reckoning used by the house of Kanishka does not refer to the Śaka era. The very name Śaka points to its foreign, and possibly north-western, origin, as the imperial Śakas resided in that region, and it is only the viceroys who dwelt in Mālwa Kāthiāwār and the Deccan. On the analogy of every famous Indian regnal reckoning it may be confidently asserted that the Śaka era, too, originated with a sovereign and not with a mere viceroy.

Even if we accept it as correct, the period of 28 years is not too short in view of the fact that Kadphises II succeeded an octogenerian. When Kadphises I died "at the age of more than eighty" his son must have been an old man. It is, therefore, improbable that "his reign was protracted.")

(*b*) Marshall, says Prof. G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, has discovered at Taxila in the Chir Stūpa a document dated 136 which, in the *Vikrama* era, corresponds to 79 A.D., and the king mentioned therein is probably Kadphises I, but certainly not Kanishka.

(Now, the epithet *Devaputra* applied to the Kushān king of the Taxila scroll of 136, is characteristic of the Kanishka group, and not of the Kadphises kings.[1] So the discovery need not shake the conviction of those that attribute to Kanishka the era of 78 A.D. The omission of the personal name of the Kushān monarch does not necessarily imply that the first Kushān is meant. In several inscriptions of the time of Kumāra Gupta and Budha Gupta, the king is referred to simply as *Gupta nṛipa*.)

(*c*) Professor Dubreuil says: "Sten Konow has shown that the Tibetan and Chinese documents tend to prove that Kanishka reigned in the second century."

(This Kanishka may have been Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date in the second century A.D. Po-t'iao of Sten Konow,[2] the king of the Yueh-chi who sent an ambassador to China in A.D. 230, may have been one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. "Coins bearing the name of

[1] I am glad to note that a somewhat similar suggestion is now made by Dr. Thomas in Dr. B. C. Law Volume, II. 312. It is, however, by no means clear why it is said that the possibility of the identification of Devaputra with Kanishka 'has been ignored'. The Kadphises kings meant here are Kujūla (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wema) and not Kuyula Kara Kaphsa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. *Kara* or *Kala* probably means a Mahārājaputra, a prince (Burrow, *The Language of the Kharoshṭhī Documents*, 82). Even if Kuyula Kara be identical with Kujūla (*cf. Corpus*, II, i. lxv) and the Kushān king of the Taxila inscription of 136, it may be pointed out that it is by no means certain that the date 136 refers to the *Vikrama* era.

[2] Vāsudeva? *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 141. *Corpus*, II, i. lxxvii; *cf. Acta*, II, 133.

Vāsudeva continued to be struck long after he had passed away."[1] Dr. Smith, Mr. R. D. Banerji and Dr. S. Konow himself clearly recognise the existence of more than one Vāsudeva.)[2]

(*d*) Sten Konow has also shown that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era and those of the Śaka era are not dated in the same fashion. (But the same scholar also shows that all the inscriptions of the Kanishka era are also not dated in the same fashion. In the *Kharoshṭhī* inscriptions, Kanishka and his successors recorded the dates in the same way as their Śaka-Pahlava predecessors, giving the name of the month and the day within the month. On the other hand, in their *Brāhmī* records Kanishka and his successors *usually* adopted the Ancient Indian way of dating.[3] Are we to conclude from this that the *Kharoshṭhī* dates of Kanishka's inscriptions are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the *Brāhmī* records are to be ascribed? If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Śaka dates we have the name of the month as in the *Kharoshṭhī* records with addition of the *Paksha*. "The Śaka era which (the Western *Kshatrapas*) used was a direct imitation of the reckoning used by their cousins in the north-west, the additional mentioning of the '*paksha*' being perhaps a concession to the custom in the part of the country where they ruled." It is not improbable that just as Kanishka in the borderland used the old Śaka-Pahlava method, and in Hindusthān Proper used the ancient Indian way of dating prevalent there, so in Western India his officer added the '*paksha*' to suit the custom in that part of the country.)[4]

[1] *EHI*, 3rd ed., p. 272.
[2] *Ibid*., pp 272-78, *Corpus*, ii, I. lxxvii.
[3] *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p 141. For an exception see *ibid*., XXI, 60.
[4] As to the statement of Fleet endorsed by S Konow. *Corpus*, lxxxvii

According to Sten Konow Kanishka came from Khotan[1] and belonged to the Little Yüeh-chi. The theory presents many difficulties.[2] It is certain that his successors in 230 were still known as the Ta (Great?) Yüeh-chi. The family name according to Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitīkā* was Kiu-sha.[3]

Kanishka completed the Kushān conquest of Upper India and ruled over a wide realm which extended from Kāpiśa,[4] Gandhāra and Kaśmīra to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāketa) and Pāṭaliputra in Eastern India are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers.[5] Epigraphic records give us contemporary notices of him, with dates, not only from Peshāwar and possibly from Zeda (near Uṇḍ) in the Yuzufzai country, but also from Māṇikiāla near Rāwalpindi, from Sui Vihār about 16 miles south-west of Bahāwalpur (north of Sind), from Mathurā and Śrāvastî, and from Sārnāth near Benares.[6] His coins are found

that the use of the Śaka era was foreign to Northern India attention may be invited to Kielhorn's *List of Ins of Northern India*, Nos 351, 352 362, 364-365, 368, 379, etc So far as North-West India is concerned there is as little positive proof of the *early* use of the *Vikrama* era as of the era of 78 A D. The paucity of early records dated in the Śaka era in the valley of the Upper Ganges and its tributaries is possibly due to the fact that the era of 58 B.C already held the field. Later eras of undoubtedly northern origin, like those of the Guptas and Harsha, have practically been forgotten, but the era of 58 B.C is still in use In Southern India the case is different. The use of regnal years in the records of the Mauryas (many of which are located in the south) and those of the Sātavāhanas, Chetas, and other early dynasties, proves beyond doubt that there was no early reckoning in use that could compete with the new era that was introduced by the Śaka satraps The story of the foundation of the Chālukya Vikrama era suggests that the Śaka reckoning was at times deliberately sought to be discontinued because of its foreign association. This might have happened in the north as well as in the south.

[1] *Corpus* II, i. lxxvi; *cf.* lxi, JRAS, 1903, 334

[2] *Ibid*, p. lxxvii

[3] *Cf* Kuśa of *Kanika lekha* and Kuśadvīpa of the *Purāṇas*. See now Shafer, *Linguistics in History*, JAOS, 67, No. 4, pp. 296 ff.

[4] *Cf.* The story of the Chinese hostage mentioned by H Tsang

[5] *Ep Ind.*, xiv, p. 142; *Ind Ant*, 1903, p 382; *Corpus*, II, i, pp. lxxii and lxxv The reference may be to Kanishka II.

[6] In recent years Mr. K. G. Goswami has drawn attention to a Brāhmī Inscription of Kanishka, dated in the year 2 (?), which he found in the Municipal Museum at Allahabad (*Calcutta Review*, July, 1934, p. 83)

in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Ghāzipur and Gorakhpur.[1] The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the *Mahā-Kshatrapa* Kharapallāna and the *Kshatrapa* Vanashpara. In the northern portion we find the general Lala and the Satraps Vespasi and Liaka. He fixed his own residence at Peshāwar (Purushapura) and possibly established Kanishkapura[2] in Kaśmīra. It is, however, more probable that Kanishkapura was established by his namesake of the Ārā inscription. After making himself master of the south (*i.e.*, India) Kanishka turned to the west and defeated the king of the Parthians.[3] In his old age he led an army against the north and died in an attempt to cross the Tsung-ling mountains (Tāghdumbāsh Pāmīr) between the Pāmīr Plateau and Khotan. The Northern expedition is apparently referred to by Hiuen-Tsang who speaks of his rule in the territory to the east of the Tsung-ling mountains, and of a Chinese Prince detained as a hostage at his court.

It is not improbable that Kanishka was the Kushān king repulsed by general Pan-ch'ao during the reign of the Emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). It has no doubt been argued that Kanishka "must have been a monarch of some celebrity and if the Chinese had come into victorious contact with him, their historians would have mentioned it." But if we identify Pan-ch'ao's Kushān contemporary with Kadphises II, the silence of the Chinese becomes still more mysterious and inexplicable because he was certainly well-known to the annalists. On the other hand, Kanishka was not known to them and the non-mention of his name, if he were Pan-ch'ao's contemporary, cannot be more surprising than that of

[1] A gold coin from Mahāsthāna (Bogra) represents the standing bearded figure of Kanishka possibly an imitation of the coinage of the great Kushān king

[2] Cunningham (AGI[2], 114) located it near Śrīnagar. Stein and Smith identify it with Kānispor, "situated between the Vitastā river and the high road leading from Varāhamūla to Śrīnagar" (EHI[4], p. 275).

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, 1903, p. 382.

his predecessor, Wema. In favour of Kanishka's identity with Pan-ch'ao's antagonist we may urge that Kanishka is known to have come into conflict with the Chinese, but the same cannot be said with regard to Wema, the events of whose reign, as recorded by Chinese annalists, do not include a first class war with China. The legend of Kanishka's death published by S. Lévi contains a significant passage which runs thus:—"I have subjugated three regions; all men have taken refuge with me, the region of the north alone has not come in to make its submission."[1] Have we not here a covert allusion to his failure in the encounter with his mighty northern neighbour?

Kanishka's fame rests not so much on his conquests, as on his patronage of the religion of Śākyamuni. Numismatic evidence and the testimony of the Peshāwar Casket inscriptions show that he actually became a convert to Buddhism possibly at the commencement of his reign, if not earlier. He showed his zeal for his faith by building the celebrated relic tower and *Saṅghārāma* at Purushapura or Peshāwar which excited the wonder of Chinese and Muslim travellers.[2] He convoked the last great Buddhist council which was held in Kaśmīra or Jālandhar.[3] But though a Buddhist, the Kushān monarch continued to honour the Greek, Sumerian, Elamite, Mithraic, Zoroastrian and Hindu gods worshipped in the various provinces of his far-flung empire.[4] The court

[1] EHI[4], p 285, JRAS, 1912, 674.

[2] The fame of the *Kanishka Mahāvihāra* remained undiminished till the days of the Pāla Kings of Bengal as is apparent from the Ghoshrāvan Inscription of the time of Devapāla Kanishka's *Chaitya* is referred to by Alberuni

[3] One account possibly mentions Gandhāra as the place where the Assembly met The earliest authorities seem to locate it in Kashmīr. *Kundalavana vihāra* appears to be the name of the monastery where the theologians assembled probably under the presidency of Vasumitra The chief business of the Synod seems to be the collection of canonical texts, and the preparation of commentaries on them (Smith, *EHI*[4], pp 283 ff; Law, *Buddhistic Studies*, 71).

[4] See JRAS, 1912, pp 1003, 1004. The Elamite (Sumerian? Hastings, 5, 827) goddess Nana possibly gave her name to the famous Nāṇaka coins (*cf.* Bhand , *Carm. Lec.*, 1921, p. 161) For the influence of the Mithra (Mihr,

of Kanishka was adorned by Pārśva, Vasumitra, Aśvaghosha,[1] Charaka, Nāgārjuna,[2] Saṁgharaksha, Māṭhara, Agesilaos the Greek and other worthies who played a leading part in the religious, literary, scientific, philosophical and artistic activities of the reign. Excavations at Māt near Mathurā have disclosed a life-size statue of the great king.[3]

After Kanishka came **Vāsishka**, Huvishka and Kanishka of the Ārā inscription. We have got inscriptions of Vāsishka dated 24 and 28 which possibly prove his control over Mathurā and Eastern Mālwa.[4] He may have been identical with Vājheshka, the father of Kanishka of the Ārā inscription, and Jushka of the *Rājataraṅginī*, the founder of the town of Jushkapur, modern Zukur to the north of Śrînagar.[5]

Huvishka's dates range from 28 to 60. A Mathurā Inscription[6] represents him as the grandson of a king who has the appellation "*Sacha dhramaṭhita*," *i.e.*, steadfast or abiding in the true Law, which occurs on the coins of Kuyula Kaphsa[7]. Kalhana's narrative leaves the impression that Huvishka ruled simultaneously with Jushka and Kanishka, *i.e.*, Vā-jheshka and **Kanishka of the Ārā inscription** of the year 41. The Wardak vase

Mihira, Miiro) cult on Kushān India, see Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaishṇavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, p. 154 According to Professor Rapson (*Indian Coins*, xii) the diversity of coin-types does not show religious eclecticism, but reflects the different forms of religion which prevailed in the various districts of the vast empire of the Great Kushāns *Cf.*, *Asāvari* and Bednur types of coins of the time of Iltutmish and of Hyder Ali.

[1] For the legend about Kanishka and Aśvaghosha see a recent article by H W Bailey (JRAS, 1942, pt I)—trans with notes of a fragment of a Khotan Ms. The king's name is spelt Cadira **(Chandra)** Kanishka.

[2] It is possible that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary, not of Kanishka I, but of Kanishka II and Huvishka

[3] EHI[4], p. 272., *Cf.* Coin-portrait, JRAS, 1912, 670.

[4] As the Sāñchī images may have been brought from Mathurā, the find-spots need not be regarded as forming necessarily a part of the empire of the king mentioned on the *pedestals*.

[5] EHI[4], p. 275.

[6] JRAS, 1924, p. 402.

[7] The epithet is also applied to Aṃgoka in the Ksharoshṭhī documents (Burrow, p. 128).

inscription possibly proves the inclusion of Kābul within his dominions. But there is no evidence that he retained his hold on the Lower Indus Valley which was probably wrested from the successors of Kanishka I by Rudradāman I. In Kaśmīra Huvishka built a town named Hushkapura.[1] Like Kanishka I, he was a patron of Buddhism and built a splendid monastery at Mathurā.[2] He also resembled Kanishka in his taste for a diversity of coin-types. Besides a medley of Greek, Persian and Indian deities we have, on one of his coins, the remarkable figure of Roma.[3] A Mathurā inscription refers to the restoration during his reign of a delapidated *Devakula* of his grandfather.

Smith does not admit that the Kanishka of the Ārā inscription of the year 41 was different from the great Kanishka. Lüders, Fleet, Kennedy and Sten Konow, on the other hand, distinguish between the two Kanishkas.[4] According to Lüders, Kanishka of the Ārā inscription was a son of Vāsishka and probably a grandson of Kanishka I. Kanishka II had the titles *Mahārāja, Rājātirāja, Devaputra* and possibly *Kaisara* (Caesar). It is probable that he, and not Kanishka I, was the founder of the town of Kanishkapura in Kaśmīra.

The last notable king of Kanishka's line was **Vāsudeva I.** His dates range from the year 67[5] to 98, *i.e.*, A.D. 145 to 176 according to the system of chronology adopted

[1] It is identified with Ushkūr inside the Bārāmūla Pass (EHI[4], p. 287)

[2] *Cf.* Luders, List No. 62.

[3] *Camb. Short Hist.*, 79. Numismatic evidence possibly suggests that the **'lion-standard'** was to some of the Great Kushāns what the *Garuḍa-dhvaja* was to their Gupta successors. *Cf.* Whitehead, 196.

[4] *Cf. Corpus*, II. 1. lxxx; 163. Ep. Ind., XIV; p. 143. JRAS, 1913, 98. The mention of a distinguishing patronymic in the record of the year 41, and the fact that no inscriptions of Kanishka are known that are referable to the period 24 to 40 of the era used by the family (when the Kushān throne was occupied by Vāsishka and, possibly Huvishka as a junior partner), suggest that Kanishka of the year 41 is *not* to be identified with Kanishka of the years 1-23.

[5] Mr. M. Nagoi makes mention of an inscription incised on the base of a stone image of the Buddha acquired from Pālikherā (Mathura Museum, No. 2907; which records the installation of the image in the year 67 during the reign of Vāsudeva.

in these pages. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist. His coins exhibit the figure of Śiva attended by Nandi. There can be no doubt that he reverted to Śaivism, the religion professed by his great predecessor Kadphises II. A king named Vāsudeva is mentioned in the *Kāvya Mīmāṁsā* as a patron of poets and a *Sabhāpati*, apparently 'President of a Society' (of learned men). That the Kushān Age was a period of great literary activity is proved by the works of Aśvaghosha, Nāgārjuna and others. It was also a period of religious ferment and missionary activity. It witnessed the development of Śaivism and the allied cult of Kārttikeya, of the *Mahāyāna* form of Buddhism and the cults of Mihira and of Vāsudeva-Krishṇa, and it saw the introduction of Buddhism into China by Kāśyapa Mātaṅga (*c.* 61-68 A.D.).

"The dynasty of Kanishka opened the way for Indian civilization to Central and Eastern Asia."

The inscriptions of Vāsudeva have been found only in the Mathurā region. From this it is not unreasonable to surmise that he *gradually* lost his hold over the north-western portion of the Kushān dominions.

About the middle of the third century A.D., we hear of the existence of no less than four kingdoms all 'dependent on the Yueh-chi,' and ruled probably by princes of the Yue-chi stock.[1]

[1] *Cf* Kennedy, JRAS, 1913, 1060 f. Among the successors of Vāsudeva I may be mentioned Kanishka (III), Vasu (Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, pp 211-12, cf. *RDB, JASB,* Vol. IV (1908), 81 ff, Altekar, NHIP, VI, 14 n) or Vāsudeva II, who is apparently to be identified with **Po-tiao** A.D. 230 (*Corpus*, II. i. lxxvii); and Grumbates(?), A.D. 360 (Smith, *EHI*[4], p 290) Kings claiming to belong to the family of Kanishka continued to rule in Ki-pin and Gandhāra long after he had passed away (*Itinerary of Oukong* Cal. Rev., 1922, Aug.-Sept., pp. 193, 489). The last king of Kanishka's race was, according to tradition, Lagatūrmān who was overthrown by his Brāhmaṇa minister Kallar (Alberuni, II, 13). For an alleged invasion of India in the later Kushān period by Ardeshir Bābagan (A.D. 226-41), the founder of the Sassanian dynasty, see Ferishta (Elliot and Dowson, VI, p. 557). Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93) conquered the whole of Śakasthāna and made his son Varhrān III Governor of the conquered territory. Śakasthāna continued to form a part of the Sassanian empire down to the time of Shāpūr II. A Pahlavī Inscription of Persepolis, which Herzfeld deciphered in 1923, dated probably in A.D. 310-11, when Shāpūr II (309-79) was on the throne, refers to the Sassanian

These were Ta-hia (the Oxus region, *i.e.*, Bactria), Ki-pin (Kāpiśa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and 'Tien-tchou' (lit. India, meaning probably the country on either side of the Indus with a vague suzerainty over a wider area). In 230 the Ta Yueh-chi, *i.e.*, the Great (?) Yueh-chi king Po-tiao sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor. The Yueh-chi kingdom of 'Tientchou' began to fall to pieces some time after this date and probably disappeared as an important power in the fourth century A.D. having already lost some of the remotest provinces to the Nāgas. Those nearer the Indus emerged as petty states. Śakasthāna and parts of North-West India were conquered by the Sassanians in the days of Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93). During the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79) the Sassanian suzerainty was still acknowledged in those regions.

SECTION IV. THE NĀGAS AND THE LATER KUSHĀNS

The successors of the Great Kushāns in Mathurā and certain neighbouring tracts were the Nāgas.[1] The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of northern and central India in the third and fourth centuries A.D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D. refers to a king named Maheśvara Nāga, the son of

ruler of Sakasthāna as "*Sakānsāh*, minister of ministers (*dabīrān dabir*) of Hind, Sakasthāna and Tukhārishthān" (*MASI*. 38, 36). The Paikuli Inscription mentions the Saka chiefs of North-Western India among the retainers of Varhran III, Governor of Śakasthāna in the last quarter of the third century A.D. (*JRAS*, 1933, 219). The Ābhiras of Western India seem also to have acknowledged the sway of the Sassanians (Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, cxxxiv). J. Charpentier points out (*Aiyangar Com.*, Vol. 16) that at the time of Kosmas Indiko-pleustes (*c* 500 A.D.) the right side of the Indus Delta belonged to Persia. Persians figure also in early Chalukya epigraphs and the *Raghuvaṁśa* of Kalidāsa.

[1] A Yūpa Inscription from Barnāla (in the Jaipur State) discloses the existence of a line of kings, one of whom bore a name that ended in—*Varddhana*. They belonged to the Sohartta or Sohartṛi *gotra*. But the dynastic designation is not known (*Ep. Ind.*, xxvi 120). The record is dated in *Kṛita* 284 corresponding to A.D. 227-28

Nāgbhaṭṭa.[1] The Allahabad Pillar, inscription refers to King Ganapati Nāga, while several Vākāṭaka records mention **Bhava Nāga** sovereign of the **Bhāraśivas** whose grandson's grandson Rudrasena II was a contemporary of Chandra Gupta II, and who accordingly must have flourished before the rise of the Gupta Empire. Some idea of the great power of the rulers of Bhava Nāga's line and the territory over which they ruled may be gathered from the fact that the dynasty performed ten *Aśvamedha* sacrifices and "were besprinkled on the forehead with the pure water of (the river) *Bhāgīrathi* (Ganges) that had been *obtained by their valour*."[2] The valiant deeds of the family culminating in the performance of ten *Aśvamedha* sacrifices indicate that they were *not* a feudatory line owing allegiance to the Kushāns. We learn from the *Purāṇas* that the Nāgas established themselves at Vidiśā (Besnagar near Bhilsa), Padmāvatî (Padam Pawāyā, "in the apex on the confluence of the Sindhu and Pāra).[3] Kāntipuri (not satisfactorily identified),[4] and even Mathurā which was the southern[5] capital of Kanishka and his successors. The greatest of the Nāga Kings was perhaps Chandrāṁśa,[6] 'the second Nakhavant,' whose name reminds us of the great king **Chandra** of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription. *It is by no means clear that the two are identical.*[7] But if Chandra preceded the

[1] Fleet, CII, p 283.

[2] CII, p. 241, AHD, p. 72.

[3] Coins of a *Mahārāja* or *Adhirāja* named Bhavanāga have been found at this place. His identity with Bhavanāga of Vākāṭaka epigraphs proposed by Dr. Altekar (J Num. S I, V pt. II) must await future discoveries.

[4] Mention is made of a Kantipurī in the *Skanda Purāṇa* (Nāgarakhaṇḍa, ch. 47. 4ff) In the story narrated in the text a petty prince of Kāntipurī 'marries a princess of Daśārna, the valley of the Dhasan, in Eastern Malwā which, in the time of the *Meghadūta*, included Vidiśā. Kāntipurī probably lay not far from the last-mentioned city

[5] JRAS, 1905, p. 233.

[6] "*Nṛpān Vidiśakāmś c=āpi bhaviṣyāmstu nibodhata*
Śeṣasya Nāga-rājasya putraḥ para puranjayaḥ.
Bhogī bhaviṣyate (?) *rājā nṛpo Nāga-kul ödvahaḥ*
Sadācandras tu Chandrāmśo dvitīyo Nakhavāṁs tathā."
—*Dynasties of the Kali Age*, p. 49.

[7] Devotion to Vishṇu may suggest identification with Chandra-Gupta I, or

rise of the Gupta empire, it is natural to seek a reference to him in the Purāṇic texts which were not compiled till the Gupta-Vākāṭaka age.

The hand of a Nāga princess was sought by Chandra Gupta II in the fourth century, and a 'Nāga' officer governed the Gangetic Doāb as late as the time of Skanda Gupta.[1] The Kushāns, however, continued to rule in the Kābul valley and parts of the Indian borderland. One of them gave his daughter in marriage to Hormisdas (or Hormuzd) II, the Sassanian King of Persia (A.D. 301-09). As already stated Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93) and his successors up to the time of Shāpūr II seem to have exercised suzerainty over their Scythic neighbours. "When Shāpūr II besieged Amida in A.D. 350, Indian elephants served under his command."[2] Shortly afterwards the Sassanian supremacy was replaced by that of the Guptas, and the "*Daivaputra Shāhi Shāhānushāhi*," *i.e.*, the Kushān monarch or monarchs of the North-West sent valuable presents to Samudra Gupta.[3] In the fifth century[4] the **Kidāra Kushāns** established their rule over Gandhāra and Kaśmīra.[5] In the sixth century the Kushāns had to fight hard against the Huns and in the following centuries, against the Muslims. In the

preferably, Chandra II But then we have to explain the significant omission of the termination-gupta in this memorable *praśasti* and the epithet Dhāva, especially as Chandra-Gupta II is known as Devagupta or Devarāja and not Dhava. One should note also the claim to have acquired *adhirājya* and victory over a Trans-Indus people by his own prowess and not as a sequel to the power and prestige won by a line of distinguished ancestors. The Vishnuite association of this great King precludes the possibility of identification with Chandra Kanishka. Identification with the first Maurya is fantastic in view of the date of the epigraph and recorded achievements of the hero which do not include the overthrow of the Nandas and clash with the Yavanas.

[1] For later traces of Nāga rule, see Bom. Gaz., I, 2, pp. 281, 292, 313, 574, Ep. Ind., X, 25.

[2] JRAS, 1913, p. 1062. Smith (EHI[4], p. 290) and Herzfeld (MASI, 38, 36) give the date A. D. 360.

[3] *Cf.* also JASB, 1908, 93.

[4] Or probably earlier (about the middle of the fourth century according to Altekar, NHIP, VI. 21).

[5] JRAS, 1913, p. 1064. Smith, *Catalogue* 64, 89. R. D. Banerji, JASB, 1908, 91.

ninth century A.D. a powerful Muslim dynasty, that of the Saffārids, was established in Sīstān (Seistan) and the sway of the family soon extended to Ghazni, Zābulistān, Herat, Balkh and Bamiyan.[1] The later kings of the race of Kanishka seem to have had one residence in Gandhāra at the city of Uṇḍ, Ohind, Waihand or Udabhāṇḍa, on the Indus. Another capital was situated in the Kābul valley. The family was finally extinguished by the Brāhmaṇa Kallār or Lalliya who founded the Hindu Shāhiyya dynasty towards the close of the ninth century A.D. A part of the kingdom of Kābul fell into the hands of Alptigin in tenth century.[2]

[1] Nazim, *The Life and Times of Sultan Maḥmud*, 186.
[2] Nazim *op. cit.*, p 26.

CHAPTER IX. SCYTHIAN RULE IN SOUTHERN AND WESTERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE KSHAHARĀTAS

We have seen that in the second and first centuries B.C., the Scythians possessed Ki-pin (Kāpiśā-Gandhāra) and Śakasthāna (Seistan) and soon extended their sway over a large part of Northern India. The principal Scythic dynasties continued to rule in the north. But a Satrapal family the Kshaharātas, extended their power to Western India and the Deccan, and wrested parts of Mahārāshṭra from the Śātavāhanas The Śātavāhana king apparently retired to the southern part of his dominions, probable to the *Janapada* of the Bellary District which came to be known as Śātavāhanihāra, and was at one time under the direct administration of a military governor (*mahāsenāpati*) named Skanda-nāga.[1] The waning power of the indigenous rulers of the Deccan and the waxing strength of the invaders seem to be hinted at in the following lines of the *Periplus* :

"The city of Calliena (Kalyāna) in the time of the elder Saraganus (probable Śātakarṇi I) became a lawful market town; but since it came into the possession of Sandanes (possible Sunandana Śātakarṇi)[2] the port is much obstructed, and Greek ships landing there may chance to be taken to Barygaza (Broach) under guard."

The name of the Scythian conquerors of the Broach region and of Mahārashṭra, Kshaharāta, seems to be identical with "Karatai," the designation of a famous

[1] Ep. Ind XIV, 155

[2] Wilson in JASB, 1904, 272, Smith ZDMG, Sept, 1903; IHQ, 1932, 234, JBORS, 1932, 7f. The adjective 'elder' becomes pointless unless the passage mentions a *younger* Saraganus, and this person can only refer to Sandanes from whom the elder king is distinguished.

Śaka tribe of the north mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy.[1]

The known members of the Kshaharāta, Khakharāta, or Chaharata family are Liaka, Patika, Ghaṭāka, Bhūmaka and **Nahapāna.** Of these Liaka, Patika, and Ghaṭāka belonged to the Taxila and Mathurā regions respectively. Bhūmaka was a *Kshatrapa* of Kāṭhiāwār. Rapson says that he preceded Nahapāna. His coin-types are "arrow, discus and thunderbolt." These types have been compared with the reverse type "discus, bow and arrow" of certain copper coins struck conjointly by Spalirises and Azes (I).

Nahapāna was the greatest of the Kshaharāta Satraps. Eight Cave Inscriptions discovered at Paṇḍulena, near Nāsik, Junnar and Karle (in the Poona district) prove the inclusion of a considerable portion of Mahārāshṭra within his dominions. Seven of these inscriptions describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadāta (Ṛishabhadatta) the Śaka, while the eighth inscription specifies the charitable works of Ayama, the *Amātya* (minister or district officer). Ushavadāta's inscriptions indicate that Nahapāna's political influence probably extended from Poona (in Mahārāshṭra) and Sūrpāraka (in North Koṅkaṇ) to Prabhāsa in Kāṭhiāwār, Mandasor (Daśapura) and Ujjain in Mālwa and the district of Ajmer including Pushkara, the place of pilgrimage to which Ushavadāta resorted for consecration after his victory over the Mālayas or Mālavas.

The Nāsik records give the dates 41, 42, and 45, of an unspecified era, and call Nahapāna a *Kshatrapa,* while the Junnar epigraph of Ayama specifies the date 46 and speaks of Nahapāna as *Mahākshatrapa.* The generally accepted view is that these dates are to be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. The name Nahapāna is no doubt Persian, but the Kshaharāta tribe

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 400. Mr. Y. R. Gupte points out (*Ind. Ant.*, 1926, 178), that among the shepherds of the Deccan we have the surname Kharāte which he considers to be a shortened form of Khakharāta (Kshaharāta).

to which Nahapāna belonged was probably of Śaka extraction and Ushavadāta, son-in-law of Nahapāna, distinctly calls himself a Śaka. It is, therefore, probable that the era of 78 A.D. derives its name of *Śaka* era from the Śaka princes of the House of Nahapāna. Rapson accepts the view that Nahapāna's dates are recorded in years of the Śaka era, beginning in 78 A.D., and, therefore, assigns Nahapāna to the period A.D. 119 to 124.[1] Several scholars[2] identify Nahapāna with Mambarus (emended into Nambanus)[3] of the *Periplus* whose capital was Minnagara in Ariake. According to one theory Minnagara is modern Mandasor,[4] and Ariake is Aparāntika.[5]

R. D. Banerji and G. Jouveau-Dubreuil are of opinion that Nahapāna's dates are not referable to the Śaka era. They say that if we admit that the inscriptions of Nahapāna are dated in the Śaka era, there will be only an interval of five years between the inscription of this king, dated 46 and the inscriptions of Rudradāman, dated 52. Within these years must have taken place:

(1) The end of Nahapāna's reign;

(2) The destruction of the Kshaharātas;

(3) The accession of Chashṭana as *Kshatrapa*, his

[1] Allan thinks that the coins of Nahapāna cannot be assigned to so late a date in the second century A.D. He points among other things to the similarity of the bust on the obverse of Nahapāna's silver coins and that on the coins of Rājuvūla But he admits that this may be due to derivations from a common prototype such as the coins of Strato I. *Camb. Short Hist*, 80 f

[2] *E.G.*, M. Boyer in *Journal Asiatique*, 1897, JASB, 1904, 272 In JRAS, 1918, 108, Kennedy points out that the name certainly ends in *bares baros* and not in *banos*.

[3] JRAS, 1912, p. 785.

[4] This is the view of D R. Bhandarkar who apparently follows *Bomb Gaz*, I 1 15 n; *Cf.*, however, *Ind Ant.*, 1926, p 143, *Capital of Nahapāna* (=Junnar). Fleet identifies Minnagara with Dohad in the Pañch Mahāls (JRAS, 1912, p. 788; 1913, 993n). In a paper read at the sixth conference of Orientalists at Patna Dr Jayaswal referred to a Jaina work which mentions Broach as the capital of Nahapāna (see now *Āvaśyaka sūtra*, JBORS, 1930, Sept. Dec, 290). For a different tradition see IHQ, 1929, 356. Vasudhara(?) *nagarī*

[5] *Cf.* also IA, 7, 259, 263: Ariake may also be Āryaka of Varāhamihira's *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*.

reign as *Kshatrapa*, his accession as a *Mahākshatrapa*, and his reign as *Mahākshatrapa;*

(4) The accession of Jayadāman as *Kshatrapa*, his reign as *Kshatrapa*, and perhaps also his reign as *Mahākshatrapa:*

(5) The accession of Rudradāman and the beginning of his reign.

There is no necessity, however, of crowding the events mentioned above within five years (between the year 46, the last known date of Nahapāna, and the year 52, the first known date of Rudradāman). There is nothing to show that Chashṭana's family came to power *after* the destruction of the Kshaharātas. The line of Chashṭana may have been ruling in Cutch and perhaps some adjacent territories, as the Andhau inscriptions of the year 52 suggest, while the Kshaharātas were ruling in parts of Mālwa and Mahārāshṭra Moreover, there is no good ground for believing that a long interval elapsed from the accession of Chashṭana to that of Rudradāman. Drs. Bhandarkar and R. C. Majumdar have pointed out that the Andhau inscriptions clearly prove that Chashṭana and Rudradāman ruled conjointly in the year 52. Professor J. Dubreuil rejects their view on the ground that there is no "*cha*" after Rudradāman in the text of the inscription: *Rājña Chasṭanasa Ysāmotika-putrasa rājña Rudradāmasa Jayadāma-putrasa varshe dvipachāse,* 50, 2. Professor Dubreuil translates the passage thus:

"In the 52nd year, in the reign of Rudradāman, son of Jayadāman, *grandson* of Chashṭana and *great-grandson* of Yśāmotika."

The Professor who objects to a '*cha*' himself makes use not only of "and" but also of the words "grandson" and "great-grandson" no trace of which can be found in the original record. Had his translation been what the writer of the Andhau inscriptions intended, we should have expected to find the name of Ysāmotika first, and then the name of Chashṭana followed by those of Jayadāman and Rudradāman—*Ysāmotika prapautrasa*

Chashṭana pautrasa Jayadāma-putrasa Rudradāmasa.[1] Moreover, it is significant that in the text of the inscription there is no royal title prefixed to the name of Jayadāman who ruled between Chashṭana and Rudradāman according to Dubreuil. On the other hand, both Chashṭana and Rudradāman are called *Rājā*. The two are mentioned in exactly the same way—with the honorific *rājā* and the patronymic. The literal translation of the inscriptional passage is "in the year 52 of king Chashṭana son of Ysāmotika, of King Rudradāman son of Jayadāman," and this certainly indicates that the year 52 belonged to the reign both of Chashṭana and Rudradāman.[2] The conjoint rule of two kings was known to ancient Hindu writers on polity.[3] The theory of the conjoint rule of Chashṭana and his grandson is supported by the fact that Jayadāman did not live to be a *Mahākshatrapa* and must have predeceased his father, Chashṭana, as unlike Chashṭana and Rudradāman, he is called simply a *Kshatrapa* (not *Mahākshatrapa* and *Bhadramukha*) even in the inscriptions of his descendants.[4] We have already noticed the fact that the title *Rājā*, which is given to Chashṭana and Rudradāman in the Andhau inscriptions, is not given to Jayadāman.

Mr. R. D. Banerji says that the inscriptions of Nahapāna cannot be referred to the same era as used on the coins and inscriptions of Chashṭana's dynasty because if we assume that Nahapāna was dethroned in 46 Ś. E., Gautamīputra must have held Nāsik up to 52 Ś. E. (from

[1] *Cf.* the Junāgaḍh, Gunda and Jasdhan inscriptions.

[2] *Cf.* the coin legends "*Heramayasa Kaliyapaya*" "*Guduphanasa Sasasa*," '*Khatapāna Hagānasa Hagāmashasa*", etc., where, too, we have no *cha* after the second name Whitehead, *Indo Greek Coins*, 86, 147, *CHI*, 538

[3] *Cf.* *Dvirāja* in the *Atharva Veda* (V. 20, 9): *Dvairājya* in the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* p. 325, *Dorajja* of the Āyāranga Sutta, the classical account of Patalene, p. 259 *ante*, the case of Dhritarāshṭra and Duryodhana in the Great Epic: of Eukratides and his son in Justin's work, of Strato I and Strato II; of Azes and Azilises, etc., etc. The *Mahāvastu* (III. 432) refers to the conjoint rule of three brothers,—'*Kalingeshu Siṁhapuraṁ nāma nagaraṁ tatra trayo bhrātaro ekamātrikā rajyaṁ kārayaṁti.*' See also IA, 6, 29 *Cf.* Nilkanta Sastri, *Pandyan Kingdom*, 120, 122, 180.

[4] *Cf.* the Gunḍa and Jasdhan inscriptions

his 18th to his 24th year), then Pulumāyi held the city up to the 22nd year of his reign, *i.e.*, up to at least 74 Ś. E. But Rudradāman is known to have defeated Pulumāyi and taken Nāsik before that time. Banerji's error lies in the tacit assumption that Rudradāman twice occupied Nāsik before the year 73 of the Śaka era. There is no clear evidence to suggest that the Śātavāhanas lost Poona and Nāsik to that great satrap though they may have lost Mālwa and the Koṅkan. Another untenable assumption of Mr. Banerji is that Rudradāman finished his conquests before the year 52 or A.D. 130, whereas the Andhau inscriptions merely imply the possession of Cutch and perhaps some adjoining tracts by the House of Chashṭana.

The theory of those who refer Nahapāna's dates to the Śaka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Professor Rapson, and Dr. Bhandarkar after him, that a Nāsik inscription of Nahapāna refers to a *gold* currency, doubtless of the Kushāns who could not have ruled in India before the first century A.D.[1]

The power of Nahapāna and his allies, the Uttamabhadras,[2] was threatened by the Mālayas **(Mālavas)** from the north, and the Śātavāhanas from the south. The incursion of the Mālavas was repelled by Ushavadāta. But the Śātavāhana attack proved fatal to Śaka rule in Mahārāshṭra.

We know very little about Chakora and Śivasvāti mentioned in the Purāṇas as the immediate successors of Sunandana during whose reign Śātavāhana prestige had sunk very low and marauders from Barygaza had been harrying the ports that had once enjoyed the

[1] Rapson, *Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, etc.*, pp. lviii, clxxxv; Bhandarkar, *Ind. Ant.*, 1918-1919, '*Deccan of the Sātavāhana Period*'.

[2] The Uttamabhadras may have been a section of the Bhadra tribe mentioned in a list of *gaṇas* along with the Rohitakas (*cf.* Rohtak in south-east Punjab), the Āgreyas (of Agra?) and the Mālavas (*Mbh.* III. 253.20). In *Mbh.* VI 50 47 the Pra-bhadras are associated with the *gaṇas* or corporations of the Dāseṛakas, apparently of the desert region of Rājputāna (Monier Williams, Dic. 405).

protection of the elder Śātakarṇi, probably Śātakarṇi I. But the king whose name occurs next in the list, *viz.*, Gautamîputra, regained the lost power of the house and dealt a severe blow at the power of the intruders from the north. The Nāsik *praśasti* calls him the "uprooter of the Kshaharāta race," and the "restorer, of the glory of the Śātavāhana family". That Nahapāna himself was overthrown by Gautamîputra is proved by the testimony of the Jogalthembi hoard (in the Nāsik district) which consisted of Nahapāna's own silver coins and coins restruck by Gautamîputra. In the restruck coins there was not a single one belonging to any prince other than Nahapāna as would certainly have been the case if any ruler had intervened between Nahapāna and Gautamîputra.

SECTION II. THE RESTORATION OF THE ŚĀTAVAHANA EMPIRE

Gautamiputra's victory over the Kshaharātas led to the restoration of the Śātavāhana power in Mahārāshṭra and some adjoining provinces. The recovery of Mahārāshṭra is proved by a Nāsik inscription, dated in the year 18,[1] and a Karle epigraph addressed to the *Amātya* or the king's officer in charge of Māmāla (the territory round Karle, modern Māval in the Poona district). But this was not the only achievement of Gautamîputra. We learn from the Nāsik record of queen Gautamî Balaśrî that her son destroyed the Śakas (Scythians), Yavanas (Greeks) and Pahlavas (Parthians), and that his dominions extended not only over Asika,[2] Asaka (Aśmaka on the Godāvarî, a part

[1] The Nāsik Edict was issued from the camp of victory of the Vejayanti army (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII. 72) and was addressed to the *Amātya* or the king's officer in charge of Govardhana (Nāsik). According to Sircar 'Vejayanti' is not a city but an epithet of *Senā* (army).

[2] On the Kṛishṇaveṇā, *i.e.*, the river Kṛishṇā (Khāravela's ins., *IHQ*, 1998, 215): *cf.* Arshika, Patañjali, IV, 2.2.

of Mahārāshṭra),[1] and Mūlaka (the district around Paiṭhan), but also over Suratha (South Kāṭhiāwār), Kukura (in Western or Central India, possibly near the Pāriyātra or the Western Vindhyas),[2] Aparānta (North Koṅkaṇ), Anupa (district around Māhiśmatî on the Narmadā), Vidarbha (Greater Berar), and Ākara-Avanti (east[3] and west Mālwa). He is further styled lord of all the mountains from the Vindhyas to the Malaya or Travancore hills, and from the Eastern (Mahendra) to the Western (Sahya) Ghāṭs. The possession of Vejayanti in the Kanarese country is possibly hinted at in the Nāsik inscription of the year 18. The names of the Andhra country (Andhrāpatha) and South Kosala are, however, conspicuous by their absence. Inscriptions, coins and the testimony of Hiuen Tsang prove that both these territories were at one time or other included within the Sātavāhana empire. The earliest Sātavāhana king whose inscriptions have been found in the Andhra region is Pulumāyi, son of Gautamîputra. It is, however, possible that some vague claim of suzerainty over the areas in question is implied in the boast that Gautamîputra was lord of the Vindhyas and the Eastern Ghāṭs (Mahendra) and that his chargers "drank the water of the three oceans" (*tisamudatoya-pîta-vāhana*). Moreover "Asika" seems to have included a considerable portion of the valley of the Kṛishṇā.

In the Nāsik *praśasti* Gautamîputra figures not only as a conqueror, but also as a social reformer. "He crushed down the pride and conceit of the Kshatriyas, furthered the interest of the twice-born, apparently the Brāhmaṇas, as well as the lowest orders (*Dvijāvarakuṭubavivadhana*)[4]

[1] Shamaśāstry's translation of the *Arthaśāstra*, p. 143, n. 2. Its capital Potana probably corresponds to Bodhan in the Nizam's dominions.

[2] *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*, XIV, 4.

[3] Eastern Malwa was possibly under Vāsishka, the successor of Kanishka, in the year 28 of the Kushān Era which corresponds to A.D. 106 according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. Ākara has been identified with Āgar, 35 miles north-east of Ujjain, Bomb. Gaz., Gujarat, 540; *Ep. Ind.*, xxiii. 102.

[4] *Kuṭumba* means 'a household', 'a family' and *avara-kuṭuba* may be taken to mean 'households or families of the lowly'. The use of the word

and stopped the contamination of the four *varṇas* (castes)."

According to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar and Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Gautamîputra reigned conjointly with his son Pulumāyi. They give the following reasons in support of their theory:—

(1) In Gautamî's inscription (dated in the 19th year of her grandson Pulumāyi) she is called the mother of the great king and the grandmother of the great king. This statement would be pointless if she were not *both* at one and the same time.

(2) If it were a fact that Gautamîputra was dead when the queen-mother's inscription was written, and Pulumāyi alone was reigning, we should expect to find the exploits of the latter also celebrated in the inscription. But there is not a word in praise of him. A king dead for 19 years is extolled, and the reigning king passed over in silence.

(3) The inscription dated in the year 24, engraved on the east wall of the Veranda of the Nāsik Cave No. 3, which records a grant made by Gautamîputra and the "king's mother whose son is living", in favour of certain Buddhist monks "dwelling in *the cave which was a pious gift of theirs,*" presupposes *the gift of the Nāsik Cave No. 3* in the 19th year of Pulumāyi. Consequently Gautamîputra was alive after the 19th year of his son.

As regards point (1), it may be said that usually a queen sees only her husband and sometimes a son on the throne. Queen Gautamî Balaśrī, on the other hand, was one of the fortunate (or unfortunate) few who saw grandchildren on the throne. Therefore, she claimed to be the mother of a great king and the grandmother of a great king.

As to point (2), is the silence satisfactorily explained by the theory of conjoint rule? Those who prefer the opposite view may point out that although it is not custom-

kutuba may suggest that the 'lowly' order or orders, whose families or households are referred to, are the traders and agriculturists (*kuṭumbika*).

ary for an ordinary subject to extol a dead king and pass over a reigning monarch in silence, still it is perfectly natural for a queen-mother in her old age to recount the glories of a son who was associated with her in a previous gift.

As to point (3), it is not clear that the gift referred to in the postscript of the year 24 was identical with the grant of the year 19 of Pulumāyi. The donors in the postscript were king Gautamîputra and the *rājamātā*, the king's mother, apparently Balaśrī, while the donor in the year 19 of Pulumāyi was the queen-mother *alone*. In the inscription of the year 24, the queen-mother is called *Mahādevî* **Jivasutā** *Rājamātā*, the great queen, the king's mother, whose *son is alive*. In Pulumāyi's inscription the epithets *Mahādevî* and *Rājamātā* are retained but the epithet "*Jīvasutā*," "whose son is alive," is significantly omitted. The donees in the former grant were the *Tekirasi* or Trirasmi ascetics in general, the donees in the latter grant were the monks of the *Bhadavānîya* school. The object of grant in the former case may have been merely the *Veranda* of Cave No. 3, which contains the postscript of the year 24, and whose existence before the 19th year of Pulumāyi is attested by an edict of Gautamîputra of the year 18. On the other hand, the cave given away to the *Bhadavānîya* monks was the whole of Cave No. 3.

If Gautamiputra and his son reigned simultaneously, and if the latter ruled as his father's colleague in Mahārāsh{ra, then it is difficult to explain why Gautamîputra was styled "*Govadhanasa Benākaṭakasvāmi*," "lord of Benākaṭaka in Govardhana" (Nāsik),[1] and why he addressed the officer at Govardhana directly, ignoring his son who is represented as ruling over Mahārāshṭra, while in

[1] The use of the expression "Govadhanasa" suggests that there were other localities named Benākaṭaka from which this particular place is distinguished. A Bennākaṭa in the eastern part of the Vākāṭaka kingdom is mentioned in the Tiroḍi plates of Pravarasena II (? III) (*IHQ*, 1935, 293; *Ep. Ind.* XXII 167 ff). Beṇā or Bennā is apparently the name of a small stream in each case.

the record of the year 19, Pulumāyi was considered as so important that the date was recorded in the years of his reign, and not in that of his father who was the senior ruler.[1]

The generally accepted view is that Pulumāyi came after Gautamīputra.

The date of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi is a matter regarding which there is a wide divergence of opinion. There are scholars who believe that the epithets *varavāraṇavikrama*, *chāru-vikrama*, "whose gait was beautiful like the gait of a choice elephant," and *Śaka-nishūdana*, destroyer of Śakas, suggest that he was the original of *Rājā* Vikramāditya of legend who founded the era of 58 B.C. But, as already pointed out, the use of regnal years by Gautamīputra and his descendants indicates that no era originated with the dynasty. Further, Indian literature clearly distinguishes between Vikramāditya of Ujjain and Śālivāhana or the Sātavāhanas of Pratishṭhāna. The view accepted in these pages is that Gautamīputra was the conqueror of Nahapāna and that his 18th year fell after the year 46 of the Śaka era, the last recorded date of his vanquished opponent. In other words the conquest of Nāsik by Gautamīputra took place some time after A.D. 78 + 46 = 124, and his accession after A.D 124—18 = 106 As he ruled for at least 24 years, his reign must have terminated after A.D. 130.

In the Purāṇic lists compiled by Pargiter the immediate successors of Gautamīputra are Pulomā, his son, and Sātakarṇi. Pulomā is doubtless identical with Siro P(t)olemaios of Baithana mentioned by Ptolemi and Vāsishthīputra Svāmi Srī **Pulumāvi** of inscriptions and coins. Sātakarṇi is perhaps to be identified with **Vāsishthiputra Śri Śātakarni** of a Kanheri Cave Inscription, or with Vāsishṭhīputra Chatarapana Sātakarṇi of a Nānāghaṭ record. His exact position in the genealogical list cannot

[1] *Cf.* R D. Banerji, *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 281 *et seq.* Note also the epithet (*Dakshiṇā*) *patheśvara* 'lord of the Deccan,' applied to Pulumāyi in the *praśasti* of the year 19.

be determined with precision. The Kanheri epigraph represents Vāsishṭhīputra Śri Śātakarṇi as the husband of a daughter of the *Mahākshatrapa* Ru(dra). Rapson identifies this Rudra with Rudradāman I. There can hardly be any doubt that the Śātavāhana king mentioned in the Kanheri record, or one of his close relations who bore a similar name, was identical with Śātakarṇi, lord of the Deccan, whom Rudradāman "twice in fair fight completely defeated, but did not destroy on account of the nearness of their connection." Dr. Bhandarkar's identification of Vāsishṭhīputra Śri Śātakarṇi of Kanheri with Vāsisṭhīputra Śiva Śri Śātakarṇi of coins and Śiva Śri of the *Matsya Purāṇa* cannot be regarded as more than a conjecture. The ruler mentioned in the Kanheri Inscription may have been a brother of Pulumāyi.

We have seen that the capital of **Pulumāyi** was Baithan, *i.e.*, Paiṭhan or Pratishṭhāna on the Godāvarī identified by Bhandarkar with Navanara or Navanagara, *i.e.*, the new city. Inscriptions and coins prove that the dominions of this king included the Krishṇā-Godāvarī reign as well as Mahārāshṭra. It has already been pointed out that the Andhra country is not clearly mentioned in the list of territories over which Gautamīputra held his sway. It is not altogether improbable that Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyi was the first to establish the Śātavāhana power firmly in that region. Sukṭhankar identifies him with Siri Pulumāyi, king of the Śātavāhanas, mentioned in an inscription discovered in the Adoni tāluk of the Bellary district. But the absence of the distinguishing metronymic makes the identification uncertain and probably indicates that the king referred to in the inscription is Pulumāyi I of the Purāṇas or some other prince of the dynasty who bore the same name. D. C. Sircar identifies him with the last king of Pargiter's list. Numismatic evidence suggests that the political influence of a Pulumāyi extended to the Coromandel coast, and possibly to the Chanda district of the Central Provinces. But in the absence of epigraphic corroboration the matter cannot be regarded as definitely

proved. Moreover, the absence of the metronymic *Vāsishṭhīputra* makes it uncertain in some cases as to whether the son of the great Gautamīputra is meant.

Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyi must have come to the throne some time after A.D. 130. He is known from a Karle epigraph to have ruled for at least 24 years, so that his reign terminated after A.D. 154.

The successors of Pulomā according to the Purāṇic lists compiled by Pargiter are Śiva, Śrī[1] Pulomā and Śivaskanda (or Śivaskandha)[2] Śātakarṇi.

Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi[3]

The immediate successor of Śivaskanda according to the collated text of Pargiter was Yajña Śrī. If the Purāṇas are to be believed his accession took place more than 35 years after the close of the reign of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, *i.e.*, after A.D. 165 and ended after A.D. 194. Yajña Śrī's inscriptions, which prove that he reigned for at least 27 years, are found at the following places, *viz.*, Nāsik in Mahārāshṭra, Kanheri in Aparānta, and China in the Krishṇā district. His coins are found in Gujrāṭ,

[1] Mirashi in the *Journal of the Num. Soc.* ii (1940), p. 88, attributes to him the coins of "Sivaśri Pulumāyi III" of the Tarhāla hoard. He draws a distinction between this king (who was a *pulumāyi*) and *Vāsiṭhiputa* Sivasiri *Sātakaṃṇi* who is known to Rapson's Catalogue. The *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, however, represents Sivaśrī as a Sātakarṇi (and not a Pulumāyi). The matter must, therefore, be regarded as *sub judice*.

[2] Mirashi (*ibid.* 89) identifies him with King Sirikhada or Skanda Sātakarṇi of the Tarhāla hoard (Akola district) and other coins whose name was wrongly read as Chaḍa Sātakarṇi by Smith and Rudra Sātakarṇi by Rapson. This "Rudra" was represented as a ruler of the Andhra-deśa.

[3] In *JRAS*, July, 1934, 560ff, Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that the name of this king was Śrī Yajña Sātakarṇi as stated in inscriptions, and not Yajña Śrī (as stated in the Purāṇas). It should, however, be remembered that *Śrī* is here an honorific and it is frequently used as a suffix in the names of members of the Śātavāhana royal house (*cf.* Veda or Skanda-Siri, Haku-Siri, Bala-Śrī, Siva-Śrī, etc.; Rapson, *Andhra Coins*, pp. xlvi, l, lii). The mere fact that in certain documents Śri precedes the name of a king does not prove conclusively that it was never used as a suffix. In the famous inscription of Khāravela the king is called both Siri Khāravela and Khāravela-Siri. In the *Mudrārākshasa* Śrīmat Chandragupta is also styled Chanda-Sīri. *Cf.* Aśoka Śrī in *Parišishṭa-parvan*, IX. 14.

Kāṭhiāwār, Aparānta, the Chanda district in the Central Provinces, and the Krishṇā district of the Madras State. There can be no doubt that he ruled over both Mahārāshṭra and the Andhra country and recovered Aparānta (N. Koṅkaṇ) from the successors of Rudradāman I. Smith says that his silver coins imitating the coinage of the Śaka rulers of Ujjain probably point to victories over the latter, and that the coins bearing the figure of a ship suggest the inference that the king's power extended over the sea. He thus anticipated the naval ventures of the Kadambas of Goa, of Sivājī and of the Angrias.[1]

Yajñaśrī was the last great king of his dynasty. After his death the Śātavāhanas probably lost North-Western Mahārāshṭra to the **Ābhīra** king Iśvarasena.[2] The later Śātavāhana princes—Vijaya, Chaṇḍa Śrī (variant Chandra Śrī) and Pulomāvi of the Purāṇas—seem to have ruled in Berar, the Eastern Deccan and the Kanarese country.[3]

[1] Rapson, however, says (*Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, p. 22) in reference to certain lead coins (of the Coromandel coast): "obv. Ship with two masts. Inscr. not completely read, but apparently *Siri-Pu* (*lumā*) *visa*."

[2] The earliest reference to the *Ābhīras* to which an approximate date can be assigned is that contained in the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali. The *Mahābhāshya* as well as the *Mahābhārata* connects them with the Śūdras—the Sodrai of Alexander's historians. Their country—Abhira—finds mention in the *Periplus* and the geography of Ptolemy. In the third quarter of the second century A.D., Ābhīra chieftains figured as generals of the Śaka rulers of Western India. Shortly afterwards a chief named Iśvaradatta, probably an Ābhīra, became *Mahākshatrapa*. His relation to the Ābhīra king Māḍharīputra Iśvara Sena, son of Śiva Datta, remains doubtful. But some scholars are inclined to identify the two chiefs. It is also suggested that this dynasty of Iśvara Sena is identical with the Traikūṭaka line of Aparānta, and that the establishment of the Traikūṭaka era in A.D. 248 marks the date at which the Ābhīras succeeded the Sātavāhanas in the Government of Northern Mahārāshṭra and the adjoining region. The last known of the Traikūṭaka line were Indradatta, his son Dahrasena (455-56 A.D.), and *his* son Vyāghrasena (489-90), after whom the kingdom seems to have been conquered by the Vākāṭaka king Harisheṇa.

[3] The Berar (Akola) group includes certain princes, not included in the Purāṇic lists, *e.g.*, Śrī Kumbha Śātakarṇi, Śrī Karṇa Sātakarṇi (unless he is identified with the so-called Svātikarṇa, the fourteenth king of Pargiter's list) and Śrī Śaka Śātakarṇi (Mirashī, *J. Num. Soc.*, II, 1940). Mirashi thinks that the real name of the so-called Krishṇa (II) of the Chanda hoard was Karṇa. Among kings of uncertain identity mention may be made of Śrī Śivamaka Sāta of the Amarāvatī inscription and Māṭhariputra Śrī Sāta of Kanheri.

The existence of Vijaya seems now to be confirmed by numismatic evidence.[1] Chaṇḍa Śrī may have been identical with Vāsiṣṭhi-putra "*Sāmi*-siri Chaṁḍa Sāta" of the Kodavali rock-cut well Inscription discovered near Piṭhāpuram in the Godāvarī region, while Pulomāvi is, in the opinion of Dr. D. C. Sircar, to be identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Myakadoni inscription of the Bellary district. Coins disclose the existence of a few other Kings of the line who must be assigned to the latest Śātavāhana period. Śātavāhana rule in the Kṛishṇā, Guṇṭūr and Bellary districts was eventually supplanted by the Ikshvākus[2] and the Pallavas.[3]

[1] Mirashi, *Journal of the Nums, Soc of India*, II (1940) p. 90. The only clear letters are *ya-Sātakaṇi*. The ascription to Vijaya must be regarded as tentative

[2] The *Ikshvākus* are known from inscriptions discovered on the ruins of the Jagayyapeta *stūpa* in the Kṛishṇā District and also at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa and Gurzala in the Guṇṭūr district (Ep. Ind., 1929, 1f; 1941, 123f). They were matrimonially connected with the Kekayas, probably a ruling family of Ancient Mysore (Dubreuil, *AHD*, pp. 88, 101). The most well-known rulers of the Ikshvāku family of the Eastern Deccan are Chāṁtamūla, Śrī-Vīra-Purusha-datta, Ehuvala Chāṁtamūla II and possibly 'Rulupurisadāta' (Ep. Ind., xxvi, 125). The Ikshvākus were succeeded by the "Ānanda" kings of Guṇṭūr, the Bṛihatphalāyanas of Kudurāhāra (near Masulipatam), the Śālaṅkāyanas of Vengī (*cf.* IA. 5, 175 and the Salakenoi of Ptolemy), and the Vishṇukuṇḍins of Lenḍulura (near Vengī)

[3] The *Pallavas*—a people of unknown origin, claiming descent from Asvatthāman and Nāga princesses, are the most important of all the dynasties that succeeded the Śātavāhanas in the Far South. The claim of descent from Brāhmaṇas of the Bharadvāja *gotra*, the performance of the *Aśvamedha* and patronage of Sanskrit learning, connect the dynasty with the Śuṅgas, while the Brāhmaṇa-Nāga connection, (*cf* *Saṁkīrṇa-jati*, *Brahma-kshatra*, SII Vol. xii, Nos. 7, 18) the performance of Vedic sacrifices including the horse-sacrifice, early association with the Śātavāhana *Janapada* in the Bellary district and the use of *Prākṛita* in their early records, connect the family with the Śātavāhanas. There is no question of any Parthian affinity as the genealogical lists of the family are singularly devoid of Parthian nomenclature. The elephant's scalp used as a crown is no test of *race* The well-known hostility of the family to the Cholas and the decidedly northern character of their culture preclude the possibility of a pure Tamil extraction. The first great Pallava king, Śiva-Skanda-varman, is known from the inscriptions found at Mayidavolu (in Guṇṭūr) and Hirahaḍagalli (in Bellary) to have ruled over an extensive empire including Kāñchī, Andhrāpatha and Śātabani *raṭṭha*, and performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. About the middle of the fourth century A.D. the emperor Samudra Gupta invaded Southern India, defeated the reigning Pallava king, Vishṇugopa, and gave a severe blow to the power and prestige of the empire of Kāñchī which, in the long run, probably led to its disruption. The evidence of the Penukoṇḍa

Provincial Government under the Śātavāhanas

A word may be said here regarding the internal

Plates, the Tālagunda inscription and the Hebbaṭa grant (IHQ. 1927, 484) seems to suggest that the Pallava supremacy continued for some time to be acknowledged by the early Gaṅgas of Anantapura and East Mysore and the early Kadambas of Vaijayantī (Banavāsi) and Mahisha-Vishaya (Mysore). The history of the Pallavas during the fifth and sixth centuries is obscure. Certain inscriptions disclose the names of the following kings, but little is known about them: —

	Kings of Krishṇā, Guṇṭūr and Nellore districts.	King of Kāñchī	
		Vishṇugopa I Skandamūla Kāṇagopa Vīrakūrcha II* Skandavarman I (Skandaśishya) | Kumāravishṇu I, recovered Kāñchī. | Buddhavarman, defeated Cholas. | Skanda II Kumāravishṇu II	Vāyalūr, Velūrpalaiyam, Darśi and Chendalūr grants.
Omgoḍu I and II Uruvupalli, Māngalūr, Pikira, Vilavatti and Chūra grants	Kumāravishṇu | Skandavarman I | Vīravarman* | (1) Vijaya Skandavarman II (Tāmbrāpa[2]) | (2) Yuva-mahārāja Vishṇugopa (Palakkada) | (3) Siṁhavarman (Daśanapura, Menmātura and Veṅgorāshtra) | (4) Vijaya-Vishṇugopa Varman (Vijay-Palotkaṭa)	Buddhavarman Skandavarman III Vishṇugopa II Vishṇudāsa Skandavarman IV Siṁhavarman I[1] Vīravarman* | Skandavarman V | Siṁhavarman II) | A.D. 436 Skandavarman VI) | Nandivarman I Siṁhavarman III, IV, (two kings of this name) Vishṇugopa III Siṁhavarman V Siṁhavishṇu | Mahendravarman I | Narasiṁhavarman I Contemporary of Pulakeśin II.	Udayendiram grant Lokavibhāga A.D. 458 and Penukoṇḍa plates[2]

* Kings marked with asterisks may have been identical. But this is by no means certain. The settlement of early Pallava genealogy and chronology must still await future discoveries.

1 A Siṁhavarman is mentioned in the Palnāḍ inscription. But his identity and date are uncertain.

2 Tāmbrāpa is identified with Chembrolu

organisation of the Śātavāhana empire. The sovereign himself seems to have resided in Pratishṭhāna or in "camps of victory" in Govardhana (Nāsik district), Vaijayantī (in North Kanara) and other places.[1] The imperial dominions were divided into administrative units called *āhāra* or *janapada* and placed under rulers who fell into two classes, *viz.*, (*a*) *amātyas* who were ordinary civil functionaries and (*b*) military governors and feudatories styled *mahāsenāpati*, *mahāraṭhi*, *mahābhoja*, and even *Rājan*. *Amātyas* are mentioned in connection with Aparānta (North Koṅkaṇ), Govardhana (Nāsik), Māmāḍ(l)a (Poona), Banavāsī (North Kanara) and Khaḍḍavali (Godāvarī region). *Mahāraṭhis* are found associated with Chitaldrug, Nānāhaṭ, Karle and Kanheri (in the North Koṅkaṇ). They intermarried with the imperial family (and at times adopted its nomenclature) and also with the Chuṭu, Kauśika and Vāsishṭha[2] clans. The *Mahābhojas* had close relations with Chuṭu rulers of Banavāsī. *Mahāsenāpatis* are found in Nāsik in the days of Yajña Śrī and in Bellary in the time of a Pulumāyi. The rule of these military governors, some of whom belonged to the Kuśika[3] family or were matrimonially connected with it, was very much in evidence in the last days of the Śātavāhana empire. Potentates with the title of *rājā* ruled in the Kolhapur region. The most notable among these were: Vāsishṭhīputra Vilivāyakura, Māṭharīputra Śivalakura and Gautamīputra Vilivāyakura (II). The Vilivāyakura group cannot fail to remind one of Baleokouros of Hippokoura mentioned by the Greek geographer Ptolemy (*c.* 150 A.D.).

It is from the ranks of military governors and feudatories that the princes who carved out independent

[1] *E.g.*, Navanara—perhaps really identical with the port of Calliena (Kalyaṇa, an ancient name of which, according to the *Bombay Gazetteer*, XIV. 114, is Navānagara).

[2] Vasishthas figure as rulers of Kalinga in later times.

[3] A Kauśikīputra Śātakarṇi is known from a coin (*Bibliography of Indian Coins*, Part I, 1950, p. 36).

principalities on the dissolution of the Śātavāhana empire, evidently sprang. The Śālaṅkāyanas (Salakenoi), for example, who appear to have been a feudatory family in the Andhra country, afterwards set up an independent sovereignty. The Pallavas were doubtless connected with the military governors of the Bellary district.

The Śātakarṇis of Kuntala

In the days of the great Gautamīputra, son of Bala Śrī, Banavāsi or Vaijayantī (Kanara) seems to have been the capital of an imperial province under an *amātya* named Śivagupta. By an obscure transition the sovereignty of the territory passed into the hands of a family, possibly styled Chuṭu in inscriptions,[1] whose connection with the Śātavāhana-Śātakarṇis is not known. The evidence of the Myakadoni inscription and notices in the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana, the *Gāthāsaptaśatī* and the *Kāvya Mīmāṁsā*, probably suggest that a group of **Śātavāhanas** receded the so-called Chuṭu *kula* in Kuntala or the Kanarese country. Some of them were great patrons of Prākrit learning. The most famous amongst them was Hāla. Another king of the group was Kuntala Śātakarṇi, mentioned in the *Kāmasūtra* whom the Purāṇas regard as a predecessor of Hāla. The **Chuṭu** line is represented by Hāritīputra Vishṇukaḍa-Chuṭu kulānanda Śātakarṇi, *Rājā* of Vaijayantīpura, and his daughter's son Śiva-Skandanāga Śrī who is identified by Rapson with Skandanāga Sātaka of a Kanheri Inscription, and also with Hāritīputra Śiva-[Skanda]-varman, lord of Vaijayantī, mentioned in a Malavalli record (in the Shimoga district of Mysore). The last identification seems to be doubtful as the mother and daughter of Vishṇukaḍa could hardly have belonged to the same *gotra*. Hāritīputra Śivavarman was apparently succeeded by the Kadambas.[2]

[1] Some scholars do not accept the theory that Chuṭu is a dynastic designation. They regard it as a personal name. *Prog. Rep. of the ASI, W. Circle*, 1911-12, p. 5.

[2] The *Kadamba* line was founded by Mayūraśarman, a Brāhmaṇa, who

SECTION III. THE ŚAKAS OF UJJAIN AND KĀTHIĀWĀR

The greatest rivals of the restored Śātavāhana Empire were at first the Śaka *Kshatrapas* of Ujjain. The progenitor of the Śaka princes of Ujjain was Ysamotika who was the father of Chashṭana, the first *Mahākshatrapa* of the family. The name of Ysamotika is Scythic.[1] His descendant, who was killed by Chandra Gupta II, is called a Śaka king by Bāṇa in his *Harsha-charita*. It is, therefore, assumed by scholars that the *Kshatrapa* family of Ujjain was of Śaka nationality.

The proper name of the dynasty is not known. Rapson says that it may have been Kārddamaka. The daughter of Rudradāman boasts that she is descended from the family of Kārddamaka kings; but she may have been indebted to her mother for this distinction The Kārddamaka kings apparently derive their name from the Kārdama, a river in Persia.[2]

According to Dubreuil, **Chashṭana** ascended the throne in A.D. 78, and was the founder of the Śaka era. But this is improbable in view of the fact that the capital of Chashṭana (Tiastanes) was Ujjain (Ozene of Ptolemy), whereas we learn from the *Periplus* that Ozene was not a capital in the seventies of the first century A.D.[3]

rose against the Pallavas and helped by "Vrihad Bāṇa" and other kings, compelled the lord of Kañchi to confer on him the *Paṭṭabandha* of military governorship. He soon pushed his conquests to the western ocean. His great-grandson Kākustha varman gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings Krishṇa varman I performed the *Aśvamedha*. Mṛigeśa varman defeated the Gaṅgas and Pallavas and had his capital at Vaijayantī. Junior branches of the family ruled at Palāśikā, Uchchaśṛingī and Triparvata. The Kadambas were finally overthrown by the Chalukyas. See Moraes, *Kadamba-Kula*, Sircar, *JIH*, 1936, 301 ff.

[1] *JRAS*, 1906, p. 211. Lévi and Konow (*Corpus*, II. 1. lxx) identify Ysamotika with Bhūmaka on the ground that the Śaka word "*Ysama*" means earth. But identity of meaning of names need not necessarily prove identity of persons. *Cf* the cases of Kumāra Gupta and Skanda Gupta.

[2] Pārasika. Shamasastry's translation of the *Kauṭilīya*, p. 86. See also *IHK*, 1933, 37 ff. *Cf*. the Artamis of Ptolemy, VI. 11. 2, a tributary of the Oxus

[3] The *Periplus* mentions Malichos (Maliku), the king of the Nabataeans, who died in A.D. 75, and Zoscales (Za Hakale), king of the Auxumites, who reigned from A.D. 76 to 80 (*JRAS*, 1917, 827-830).

The *Periplus* speaks of Ozene as a former capital, implying that it was not a capital in its own time. The earliest known date of Chashṭana is Ś. E. 52, *i.e.*, A.D. 130. We learn from the Andhau inscriptions that in the year A.D. 130 Chashṭana was ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. Professor Rapson and Dr. Bhandarkar point out that his foreign title *Kshatrapa*, and the use of the *Kharoshṭhī* alphabet on his coins, clearly show that he was a viceroy of some northern power—probably of the Kushāns. Jayadāman, son of Chashṭana, seems to have acted merely as a *Kshatrapa* and to have predeceased his father, and the latter was succeeded at *Mahākshatrapa* by Rudradāman.

Rudradāman[1] became an independent *Mahākshatrapa* some time between the years 52 and 72 (A.D. 130 and 150). We learn from the Junāgaḍh Rock Inscription of the year 72 that men of all castes chose him as protector and that he won for himself the title of *Mahākshatrapa*. This probably indicates that the power of his house had been shaken by some enemy (possibly Gautamīputra), and he had to restore the supreme satrapal dignity by his own prowess.

The place names in the inscription seem to show that the rule of Rudradāman extended over Purv-āpar-Ākar-Āvanti (East and West Mālwa), Anupa-nivṛit or the Māhishmatī region (Māndhātā in Nimāḍ, or Maheśvara),[2] Ānartta[3] (territory around Dwārakā), Surāshṭra (district around Junāgaḍh), Svabhra (the country on the banks of

[1] For reference to Rudradāman in literature, *see* Chatterjee, *Buddhistic Studies* (ed. Law), pp. 384 f.

[2] *IA*, 4. 346.

[3] Ānartta may according to some, however, designate the district around Vaḍanagara (*Bom. Gaz.* 1. i. 6). In that case Kukura may be placed in the Dwārakā region. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers to Dwārakā as "*Kukur Andhaka-Vṛishṇibhiḥ guptā*" (1. 11. 10). The *Vāyu Purāṇa* (ch. 96. 134) represents Ugrasena, the *Yādava rājā as Kukurodbhava*, of Kukura extraction. In Mbh. III. 183. 32, too, Kukuras are closely associated with Daśārhas and Andhakas who are known to have been Yādava clans. In II. 52. 15 they are associated with the Ambashṭhas and the Pahlavas. A branch of the people may have lived in the lower valley of the Chenab and the Indus, while another branch occupied a portion of Kāṭhiāwār.

the Sābarmatī), Maru (Mārwār), Kachchha (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvīra (the Lower Indus Valley),[1] Kukura (probably between Sind and the Pāriyātra Mt.),[2] Aparānta (N. Konkaṇ),[3] Nishāda (in the region of the Sarasvatī and the Western Vindhyas),[4] etc. Of these places Surāshṭra, Kukura, Aparānta, Anupa and Ākarāvanti formed part of Gautamīputra's dominions, and must have been conquered either from that king or one of his immediate successors. The Junāgaḍh inscription gives the information that Rudradāman twice defeated Śātakarṇi, lord of the Deccan, but did not destroy him on account of their near relationship. According to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar this Śātakarṇi was Gautamīputra himself, whose son Vāsishṭhīputra Śātakarṇi was Rudradāman's son-in-law. According to Rapson the lord of the Deccan defeated by the Śaka ruler was Pulumāyi. It is more probable that the defeated ruler was Vāsishṭhîputra Śātakarṇi himself, who may have been a brother and a predecessor of Pulumāyi.

The Great Satrap also conquered the Yaudheyas, possibly of Johiya-bār along the Sutlej, who are known, from a stone inscription, to have occupied also the Bijayagaḍh region in the Bharatpur state. If the Kushān

[1] Sindhu is the inland portion lying to the west of the Indus (Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, II. 252, 253, read with 256; Vātsyāyana, *Kāmasūtra*, Benares Ed. 295). Sauvīra includes the littoral (*Milinda Pañho*, S.B.E. XXXVI, 269) as well as the inland portion lying to the east of the Indus as far as Multān (Alberuni, I, 302, *IA*, 7. 259) The Jaina *Pravachanasāroddhāra* names Vītabhaya as the capital.

[2] *Bṛihat Saṁhitā*, V. 71; XIV. 4.

[3] Aparānta in its extended sense (*cf* Aśoka, *RE.* V) no doubt embraces not only Śūrpāraka but Nāsik, Bharukachchha, the Mahī valley, Cutch, Surāshṭra, Ānartta, Abu, etc. (*Vāyu*, 45. 129 f., *Matsya*, 114. 50-51, *Mārk.* 57 49 f.—the Purāṇic text is corrupt and Śurpārakāh Kachchīyāḥ and Ānarttāḥ should be substituted for Śūryārakāḥ, Kāśmīrāḥ and Āvantyāḥ). But as the Junāgadh record distinguishes Aparānta from Surāshṭra, Ānartta, etc., it is clearly used here in its restricted sense.

[4] *Cf. Nishāda-rāshṭra*, Mbh., III. 130. 4 (the place of the disappearance—*Vinaśana*—of the river Sarasvatī is described as the *dvāra* of *Nishādarāshṭra*); note also *Pāriyātracharaḥ*, Mbh. XII. 135. 3-5. In Mbh. ii. 31. 4-7 a Nishādabhūmi is placed between the Matsyas (of Jaipur) and the Chambal. The Vedic commentator Mahīdhara explains the word Nishāda as meaning a Bhil (*Vedic Index*, I. 454). According to Bühler (*IA*. 7. 263) Nishāda probably corresponded with Hissar and Bhatnīr.

chronology accepted by us be correct, then he must have wrested Sindhu-Sauvīra from one of the successors of Kanishka I.

Rudradāman apparently held his court at Ujjain, which is mentioned by Ptolemy as the capital of his grandfather Chashṭana, placing the provinces of Ānarta and Surāshṭra under his Pahlava (Parthian) *Amātya*[1] Suviśākha. The *Amātya* constructed a new dam on the famous Sudarśana Lake which owed its origin to the "care bestowed by the Maurya government upon question of irrigation, even in the most remote provinces."

The Great *Kshatrapa* is said to have gained fame by studying grammar (*śabda*), polity (*artha*), music (*gandharva*), logic (*nyāya*), etc. As a test of the civilised character of his rule it may be noted that he took and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle. The Sudarśana embankment was rebuilt and the lake reconstructed by "expending a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by exacting taxes (*Kara*), forced labour (*Vishṭi*) benevolences (*Praṇaya*), and the like.[2] The king was helped in the work of government by an able staff of officials, who were "fully endowed with the qualifications of ministers" (*amātya-guṇa samudyuktaih*) and were divided into two classes, *viz.*, *Matisachiva* (Counsellors) and *Karma-sachiva* (Executive Officers).

Rudradāman had at least two sons and one daughter. The princess was given in marriage to Vāsishṭhîputra Śrī Śātakarṇi of the Śātavāhana family of the Deccan. A Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscription[3] refers to a princess from

[1] With this bureaucratic designation is to be contrasted the title *Rājā* applied to Tushāspha, the local ruler of Surāshtra in the days of Aśoka, who "was more than a mere official" (*IA*. 7. 257 n). While some of the Śaka provinces or districts were placed under *amātyas* or officers whose functions were mainly of a civil character, others seem to have been governed by generals (*Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*). The name of such a military governor is disclosed by a Sāñchi inscription (*JASB*. 1923. 343)

[2] *Bomb. Gaz.* I. 1. 39

[3] *Ep Ind.*, XX 1. ff.

Ujjain named Rudradhara Bhaṭṭārikā who was the queen (*Mahādevī*) of an Ikshvāku ruler of the Guṇṭūr district and some adjoining regions in the lower Kṛishṇā valley. It has been surmised by Vogel that she probably belonged to the house of Chashṭana. Her father is styled a *Mahārāja*, a title which seems to have been formally assumed by one of the latest successors of Rudradāman I, *viz.*, Svāmī-Rudrasena III, who ruled from *c.* A.D. 348 to 378, and was, apparently, a contemporary of Samudra-Gupta. It is, however, difficult to say if the Ikshvāku queen was a daughter of Rudrasena III or of some earlier prince.

Rudradāman I was succeeded by his eldest son **Dāmaghsada I.** After Dāmaghsada there were, according to Rapson, two claimants for the succession: his son Jīvadāman and his brother Rudra Siṁha I. The struggle was eventually decided in favour of the latter. To *Rudra* **Siṁha's** reign belongs the Guṇḍa inscription of the year 103 (=A.D. 181) which records the digging of a tank by an Ābhira general named Rudradhūti, son of the general Bāpaka or Bāhaka. The Ābhiras afterwards possibly usurped the position of *Mahākshatrapa*. According to Dr. Bhandarkar an Ābhira named Iśvaradatta was the *Mahākshatrapa* of the period 188-90 A D. But Rapson places Iśvaradatta after A.D. 236.

Rudra Siṁha I was followed by his sons **RudrasenaI,**[1] Saṅghadāman and Dāmasena. Three of Dāmasena's sons became *Mahākshatrapa*, *viz.*, Yaśodāman, Vijaysena and Dāmajada Śrî. This last prince was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II who was followed by his sons Viśvasiṁha and Bhartṛidāman. Under Bhartṛidāman his son Viśvasena served as *Kshatrapa*.

The connection of Bhartṛidāman and Viśvasena with the next *Mahākshatrapa* **Rudradāman II** and his successors cannot be ascertained. The last known member of

[1] To Rudrasena's reign belong the Mulwasar tank inscription, and the Jasdhan Pillar Inscription of A.D. 205. In the latter epigraph we have the title *Bhadramukha* applied to all the ancestors of Rudrasena, excepting Jayadāma.

the line was **Rudra Siṁha III** who ruled up to at least A.D. 388.

Rapson points out that from A.D. 295 to *c.* 340 there was no *Mahākshatrapa.* The elder branch of the family came to an end after 305 and passed by an obscure transition to a new line of Satraps and Great Satraps. The rulers from A.D. 295 to 332 held only the subordinate title of Satrap, and the higher title was not revived till a few years before A.D. 348, when Rudrasena III styled himself *Rājā Mahākshatrapa* and *Mahārāja Kshatrapa.* Now, it is precisely during the period when the old line passed away in obscurity, and the office of *Mahākshatrapa* remained in abeyance, that we find Śakasthāna and portions of Hind annexed to the Sassanian empire and dominated by Sassanian viceroys. The Sassanian conquest began before the end of the reign of Varhrān (Bahrām) II (A.D. 293) and the Sassanian suzerainty was maintained till the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79). The hold of the Persians on the distant Indian provinces became weak in the middle of the fourth century A.D. when Rudrasena III assumed the title of *Mahārāja,* and Samudra Gupta, the prototype of the Raghu of Kālidāsa, forced the foreign potentates of the north-west borderland to do him homage.

The revived power of the Śakas of Western India did not last long, being finally destroyed by the Guptas. Already in the time of Samudra Gupta the Śakas appear among the peoples who hastened to buy peace by the offer of maidens and other acts of respectful submission. The Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II testify to that monarch's conquest of Eastern Mālwa. One of the Inscriptions commemorates the construction of a cave by a minister of Chandra Gupta who "came here, accompanied by the king in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world." The subjugation of western Mālwa is probably hinted at by the epithet "*Siṁha-vikrānta-gāmini,*" resorting to (as a vassal of) Siṁha Vikrama, *i.e.,*

Chandra Gupta II, applied to Naravarman of Mandasor.[1] Evidence of the conquest of Surāshṭra is to be seen in Chandra Gupta's silver coins which are imitated from those of Śaka Satraps. Lastly, Bāṇa in his *Harsha-charita* refers to the slaying of the Śaka king by Chandra Gupta: *Ar(l ?) ipure cha para-kalatra kāmukam kāminī-veśa-guptaścha Chandra Guptaḥ Śaka-patim aśātayaditi.*[2]

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, 1913, p. 162. The small copper coins of Chandra Gupta II bearing a vase as type were probably struck by him in the Mālava territory which may have been under Śaka domination in the second century A.D. (Allan, *CICAI*, cvi).

[2] According to the commentator Śaṅkara the *Parakalatra* and *Kāminī* referred to above was Dhruva-devī, and the ruler of the Śakas was secretly killed by Chandragupta disguised as Dhruva-devī while the former was making advances of love. The *Śṛingāraprakāśa* by Bhoja throws additional light on the point quoting passages from the *Devīchandraguptam* (see *Aiyangar Com. Vol.*, 359 ff; also Lévi, *JA*, 1923, 201 ff; *Devīchandraguptam* by A. Rangaswami Sarasvatī, *Ind. Ant.*, 1923, p. 181 ff.) The last mentioned work is a play by Viśākhadatta, the author of the *Mudrārākshasa*. Quotations from the *Devīchandraguptam* are also found in the *Nāṭya darpaṇa* of Rāmachandra and Guṇachandra.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE ŚAKAS OF UJJAIN

SECTION IV. ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY OF THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD.[1]

The little that we know about the administration of the Scythian Epoch leaves no room for doubt that the institutions of the age were not haphazard improvisations of military upstarts, having no relations with the past, but a highly developed and organised system—the fruit of the labours of generations of political theorists and practical statesmen (*Vaktṛi-Prayoktṛi*).

The influence of political thinkers (*Arthachintakas*) on Indo-Scythian Polity is evident. The ablest among the princes of the time assiduously studied the science of polity (*Arthavidyā*)[2]; and the care taken to train the occupant of the throne, the employment of officers endowed with ministerial qualifications (*Amātyaguṇa*), the classification of ministers and other high officials (*Sachivas*), abstention from oppressive imposition of *Praṇaya* (Benevolences), *Vishṭi* (forced labour) etc., and the solicitude for the welfare of the *Pauras* and *Jānapadas*, people of cities as well as country parts, clearly show that the teaching of the writers of treatises on polity (*Arthaśāstra*) was not lost upon the Scythian conquerors of India. There was no great cleavage with the past, and the references to *Mahāmātras*,[3] *Rajjukas*[4] and *Samcharaṁtaka* or *Sañchārin*[5] spies, indicate that the official machinery of the Maurya period had not ceased to function at least in Southern India.

[1] The expression 'Scythian Period'' has been used in this section in a broad sense to denote the epoch of all the Post-Mauryan dynasties that ruled in India during the centuries immediately preceding and succeeding the Christian era. During the greater part of this period the most powerful potentate in India was the Scythian "King of Kings" who had his metropolis in the North-West, but whose commands were not unoften obeyed on the banks of the Ganges and the Godāvarī. See *Cal. Rev., Sept.,* 1925.

[2] The Junāgaḍh Inscription of Rudradāman (*Ind. Ant.*, 1878, p. 261; *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, 36 f.).

[3] Lüders' Ins., Nos. 937, 1144. Note the employment of a *Śramaṇa* as *Mahāmātra* (High Officer) by a Śātavāhana ruler.

[4] Ins. Nos. 416, 1195. The *Rajjukas* were Surveyors and Judges in the country parts.

[5] Ins., No. 1200; *cf. IA*, 5, 52, 155.

But we must not suppose that the entire administrative structure of the period was a replica of the Maurya constitution. The foreign conquerors of North-Western India brought with them several institutions which had been prevalent for ages in the countries through which they passed. Thus the Persian system of government by Satraps was introduced in several provinces of Northern, Western and Southern India, and officials with the Greek titles of *Meridarch*[1] (probably District Officer) and *Strategos* (general or governor) ruled contemporaneously with functionaries having the Indian designation of *Amātya* (minister or civil officer in charge of a district) and *Mahāsenāpati* (great general or military governor).

The tide of Scythian invasion could not sweep away the **tribal republics** which continued to flourish as in the days of Buddha and Alexander. Inscriptions and coins testify to the existence of many such communities,[2] and like the *Lichchhavis* and *Śākyas* of old, the most powerful among them were found very often ranged against their aggressive royal neighbours who were now mostly Scythian. Unfortunately, the contemporary records do not throw much light on their internal organisation, and it serves no useful purpose to ascribe to them institutions which really belong to their predecessors or successors.

Though the Scythians could not annihilate the republican clans, they did destroy many monarchies of Northern and Western India, and introduce a more exalted type of kingship. The exaltation of monarchy is apparent from two facts, namely, the assumption of high-sounding semi-divine honorifics by reigning monarchs, and the apotheosis of deceased rulers. The deification of rulers, and the use of big titles are not unknown to ancient Indian

[1] A Meridarkha Theudora is mentioned in a Swāt Kharoshṭhī epigraph. Another Meridarkha is mentioned in a Taxila Kharoshṭhī Inscription. The two *meridarchs* are mentioned as establishing Buddhist relics and sanctuaries (*Corpus*, II. i. xv).

[2] *E.g.*, the Mālavas (Mālayas), Yaudheyas, Ārjunāyanas and possibly the Audumbaras, Kulūtas, Kunindas (see *Camb. Hist.*, 528, 529), and Uttamabhadras. *Cf.* Smith. *Catalogue of Coins*, Sec. VII.

literature, but it is worthy of note that a supreme ruler like Aśoka, whose dominions embraced the greater part of India and possibly Afghanistān, was content with the titles of "*Rājā*" and "*Devānampriya Priyadasi*."[1] The great rulers of the Scythian age, on the other hand, were no longer satisfied with those modest epithets, but assumed more dignified titles like *Chakravartin* (emperor of a circle of states), *Adhirāja* (super-king), *Rājātirāja* (supreme king of kings), and *Devaputra* (the son and not merely the beloved of the gods).

In Southern India we come across titles of a semi-religious character like *Kshemarāja*,[2] *Dharma-Mahārājādhirāja* and *Dharma-Yuvamahārāja*,[3] assumed by pious defenders of Indian faiths, engaged in upholding *dharma* as practised by the ancient teachers and law-givers, and purging it of the evils of the Kali Age, probably to distinguish themselves from the unbelieving foreigners and barbarian outcastes of the North-West.

The assumption of big titles[4] by kings and emperors was paralleled by the use of equally exalted epithets in reference to their chief consorts. Aśoka's queens appear to have been styled merely *Devī*. The mother of Tīvara, for instance, is called "*Dutīā Devī*" (the second queen) and the implication is that the elder queen was *Prathamā*

[1] 'Of Gracious Mien, Beloved of the Gods.

[2] Luders' Ins., No. 1345. The beneficent or propitious king', 'prince of peace'.

[3] "The Righteous King of Kings", "the Righteous Crown Prince' Lüders' Ins., Nos. 1196, 1200. For the significance of the title, *cf.* *IA*, 5, 51, "*Kaliyuga-doshāvasanna-dharmoddharaṇa-nitya sannaddha*," Cf. also the epithets "*Manvādi-praṇīta-vidhi-vidhānadharmā Dharmarāja iva*," "*prakshālita-kalikalaṅkaḥ*" applied to the Maitraka Kings of Valabhī (*Bhavnagar Inscriptions*, 31). Sometimes even Śaka rulers and generals posed as *Dharma vijayī* (JASB, 1923, 343).

[4] It is a characteristic of Indian history that imperial titles of one period became feudatory titles in the next. Thus the title *Rājā* used by Aśoka became a feudatory title in the Scythian and Gupta periods, when designations like *Rājarājā*, *Rājādhirāja*, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Parama-Bhaṭṭāraka* and *Parama-Rājādhirāja* (Allan, 63), came into general use. But even *Mahārājādhirāja* became a feudatory designation in the age of the Pratihāras when the loftier style of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Parameśvara* was assumed by sovereign rulers.

Devī. But in the Scythian epoch we come across the titles of *Agra-Mahishī* and *Mahādevī* which distinguished the chief queen from her rivals. Among such chief consorts may be mentioned Ayasi-Kamuia, Nāganikā, and Balaśrī.

The apotheosis of deceased rulers is strikingly illustrated by the practice of erecting *Devakulas* or "Royal galleries of portrait statues." The most famous of these structures was the *Devakula* of the *Pitāmaha* (grandfather) of Huvishka referred to in a Mathurā inscription.[1] The existence of royal *Devakulas* as well as ordinary temples, and the presence of the living *Devaputra* probably earned for Mathurā its secondary name of "The city (?) of the gods."[2]

The exaltation of royalty in the epoch under review had the sanction of certain writers on kingly duty (*Rājadharma*) who represented the king as a "*mahatī devatā*," a great divinity, in human shape. But it was probably due in the first instance to the Scythians[3] who acted as carriers of Persian, Chinese and Roman ideas of kingship. The title *Rājātirāja*, supreme king overpassing

[1] *JRAS*, 1924, p. 402. For images of later kings, cf. *Beginnings of South Indian History* 144, 153, Raverty, *Tabaqāt*, I, 622 (effigy of Bikramajit), C. S. Srinivasachari, *The Evolution of Political Institutions of South India*, Section IV ("*The Young Men of India*," June and July, 1924), p. 5. Images of Sundara Chola and one of his queens were set up in the Tanjore temple and deified. C. V. Vaidya (*Mediaeval Hindu India*, I, 98) refers to the prevalence of the custom of raising some temples at the place of burning the dead body of the kings. But it is not clear if the temples contained images of the dead king and his queens. The deification and worship of the dead kings may be compared to *devapitṛipūjā* referred to in the *Kauṭilīya* (II 6).

[2] For a different suggestion see Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 252. Tarn prefers to translate Ptolemy's phrase as 'daughter of the gods' But see Lévi, *JA*, 1915, p. 91.

[3] The titles 'Theos' and 'Theotropos' were used by certain Indo-Greek rulers, but their example does not seem to have been widely followed. Gondophernes, it is true, calls himself *Devavrata*, but not yet *Deva* or *Devaputra* As to the theory that the Kushāns had been invested competitively with the title "son of the gods" in opposition to the Hiungnu rather than to the Chinese, it has to be admitted that there is no definite evidence that the title in question originated with the Hiungnu, and was *not* borrowed in ancient times from the Chinese. Pace, *B. C. Law Volume*, II. 305 ff. The Kushāns had direct contact with the Chinese in the time of Panchao

other kings, as Rapson points out, is "distinctively Persian." "It has a long history from the *Xshāyathiyānām Xshāyathiya*[1] of the inscriptions of Darius down to the *Shāhān Shāh* of the present day." The Kushān epithet "*Devaputra*" is apparently of Chinese origin, being the literal translation of the Chinese emperors' title "Son of Heaven" (*Tien-tze; tien tzu*).[2] If Lüders is to be believed, one at least of the Indo-Scythian sovereigns (Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription) assumed the Roman title of "*Kaisar*," and the dedication of temples in honour of emperors on the banks of the Tiber may have had something to do with the practice of erecting *Devakulas* on the banks of the Jumna.

A remarkable feature of the Scythian Age was the wide prevalence of the system of *Dvairājya* or Diarchy in Northern and Western India and *Yauvarājya* (rule of a crown-prince) in N. W. India and the Far South. Under both these forms of government the sovereign's brother, son, grandson, or nephew had an important share in the administration as co-ruler or subordinate colleague. In a *Dvairājya* or Diarchy the rulers appear to have been of equal status, but in a *Yauvarājya* (rule of a crown-prince) the reigning prince was apparently a vicegerent. As instances of *Dvairājya* may be mentioned the cases of Lysias and Antialkidas, Agathokleia and Strato I, Strato I and Strato II, Spalirises and Azes, Hagāna and Hagāmasha, Gondophernes and Gad, Gondophernes and Abdagases, Chashṭana and Rudradāman, Kanishka II and Huvishka etc., etc. Among ruling *Yauvarājas* may be mentioned

[1] *Cf.* the use of the term '*Kshapayitvā*' in connection with the subversion of the Śunga sovereignty by Simuka. The expressions *Kshatrasya Kshatra* (*Bṛihad Araṇyaka Upanishad*, I. 4. 14). *Adhirāja, Chakravartin*, etc., are, no doubt, known to our ancient literature. But there is no proof of the use of the last two as formal styles of sovereigns till the Post-Mauryan period, while the first is never so used.

[2] *JRAS*, 1897, 903; 1912, 671, 682, Allan, *Coins of the Gupta Dynasties*, xxvii. Artabanus (I or II) called himself 'son of a God' (Tarn, *The Greeks*, p. 92). This may suggest Greek influence too. Some writers fail to distinguish between occurrence of similar royal epithets in *literature* and their *formal* use in contemporary *epigraphic records* in the time of the Kings themselves (*B. C. Law Volume*, II, pp. 305 ff).

Kharaosta and the Pallava *Yuva-Mahārājas* Śiva-Śkanda-varman, Vijaya-Buddha-varman[1] and Vishṇugopa of Palakkada.

The king or viceroy, resided in cities called *Adhishṭhāna*. The number of such *Adhishṭhānas* and various other kinds of cities (*Nagara, Nagarī*), was fairly numerous. But regarding their administration our information is very meagre. We hear of "*nigama-sabhās*" or town councils and of a city official called *Nagarākshadarśa*[2] whose functions are nowhere distinctly stated in the inscriptions but seem to have been similar to those of the *Nagara-vyāvahārikas*, or city judges, of the Maurya Age.

Regarding general administration, and the government of provinces, districts and villages, we have more detailed information. The designations of some of the highest officers of state did not differ from those in vogue during the Maurya period. *Mahāmātras*, and *Rajjukas* play an important part in the days of the *Śātavāhanas* and Scythians as in the time of Aśoka. But side by side with these functionaries we hear of others who do not figure in inscriptions of the Maurya Epoch although some of them appear in the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya.

The officers most intimately associated with the sovereign were the privy councillors,—the *Matisachivas* of the Junāgaḍh epigraph and the *Rahasyādhikṛta* of the Pallava grants. Among other prominent court officials must be mentioned the *Rāja Vaidya*,[3] Royal Physician and the *Rāja Lipikara*, Royal Scribe.[4]

No less important than the privy councillors were

[1] IHQ, 1933, 211.

[2] EHI[4], 226; Lüders' Ins., No. 1351 (Udayagiri Cave Inscription). *Cf.* *Akshadarśa*, Patañjali, *Index of Words*. Oka, *Amarakośa*, 123, *Agni Purāṇa*, 366. 3; *Vin.* iii. 47. According to the last mentioned text the '*akkhadassas* constituted a class of *Mahāmattas*, like their prototypes in the time of Aśoka. In later ages the *Akshadarśa* might have had revenue functions. *Cf.* Kshīra's comment on the passage from the *Amarakośa* referred to above. The duties of the *Akshapaṭalikas* of the Gupta period may be mentioned in this connection.

[3] Ins., 1190-93.

[4] Ins., 271; Kauṭ., II, 10.

the high military officials—the *Mahāsenāpati*,[1] the *Daṇḍanāyaka* and the *Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka*[2] who probably correspond to the *Senāpati* and *Nāyaka*[3] of the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*. These important functionaries had probably under them subordinates like *Senāgopas* (captains), *Gaulmikas*[4] (commanders of platoons), *Ārakshādhikṛitas*[5] (guards) *Aśvavārakas*[6] (troopers), *Bhaṭamanushyas*[7] (mercenaries), etc.

We have already referred to one class of civil officers (*Amātyas* or *Sachivas*), *viz.*, the *Mati sachivas* (counsellors). There was another class of *Amātyas* who served as executive officers (*Karma sachivas*). From them were chosen governors,[8] treasurers[9] superintendents,[10] and secretaries[11] as in the days of Megasthenes.

Among treasury officials mention is made of the *Gaṁjavara*,[12] the *Kashṭhāgārika*[13] and the *Bhāṇḍāgārika*[14] who was one of the principal ministers of state (*Rājāmātya*). But we have no epigraphic reference to the *Sannidhātṛi* (*lit.* piler) or the *Samāhartṛi* (collector) till the days of the "Śaila" kings of the Vindhyas and the Somavaṁśi kings of Kosala. The main heads of revenue received into the *Bhāṇḍāgāra* or *Kośa* (treasury) were, as enumerated in the Junāgaḍh Inscription, *Bali* (extra tribute), *Śulk* (duty), and *Bhāga* (customary share of the king). These sufficed to fill the exchequer of a benevolent prince like Rudradā-

[1] 1124, 1146.

[2] 1328, *cf.* Majumdar's *List of Kharoshthi Ins* No 36. For the duties of a *Daṇḍanāyaka*, *cf* *IA*, 4, 106, 275n, 5, 49; *Fleet*, *CII*, 16. Daṇḍanāyakas sometimes carved out principalities (*rājya*) for themselves (*JASB*, 1923, 343).

[3] Kauṭ., Bk. X. Ch. 1, 2. 5

[4] Lüders' *Ins.*, 1200; *Ep Ind* XIV, 155, *cf*. *Manu*, VII, 190.

[5] Lüders, 1200.

[6] Luders, 381, 728.

[7] Lüders, 1200.

[8] Lüders' Ins., 965.

[9] 1141.

[10] 1186.

[11] 1125.

[12] Luders, 82, *Rājataraṅgini* V 177. Note the employment of a Brāhmaṇa treasurer by a Scythian ruler

[13] *Ep Ind.*, XX, 28.

[14] Lüders, 1141.

man with *kanaka* (gold), *rajata* (silver), *vajra* (diamond), *vaiduryaratna* (beryl), etc. Rulers less scrupulous than the *Mahākshatrapa* doubtless oppressed the people with arbitrary imposts, forced labour and benevolences (*kara-vishṭi-praṇaya-kriyā-bhiḥ*). Besides the *Bhāṇḍāgāra* whose existence is implied by Lüders' Ins., No. 1141, we have reference to the storehouse, *Koshṭhāgāra*,[1] which is described in Book II, Chapter 15, of the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*. The inscriptions afford us glimpses of the way in which the revenue was spent. The attempts to provide for "*pānīya*" or drinkable water are specially noteworthy. The Junāgaḍh Inscription tells us how "by the expenditure of a vast amount of money from his own treasury" a great Scythian ruler and his *amātya* restored the Sudarśana lake. References to the construction or repair of tanks, wells, lakes and other reservoirs of water, *Pushkariṇīs*, *udapānas*, *hradas* or *taḍāgas*, are fairly common. Lüders' Ins., No 1137, makes mention of makers of hydraulic engines (*Audayantrika*), while another epigraph[2] refers to a royal official called *Pānīyagharika* or superintendent of water-houses Inscription No. 1186, after recording the gift of a *taḍāga* (pond), a *nāga* (statue of a serpent deity) and a *vihāra* (pleasance, monastery), refers to the *Amātya* Skandasvāti who was the *Karmāntika* (superintendent of works), an official designation known to the *Arthaśāstra*.[3]

In the department of Foreign Affairs we have the *Dūta* (envoy or messenger), but we do not as yet hear of dignitaries like the *Sāmdhivigrahika* (officer in charge of peace and war) and *Kumārāmātya*[4] who figure so prominently in inscriptions of the Gupta and Post-Gupta periods.

Inscriptions of the period under review refer also to

[1] In *Ins.* No. 937.

[2] Lüders, 1279.

[3] Bk. I, Ch. 12.

[4] *Kumāra* means 'a youth', 'a prince' Hence *Kumārāmātya* may mean 'junior minister', or 'prince's minister'. The word *Kumāra* as the opposite of *Prauḍha* may correspond to *Chikka*, *Chenna* or *Immaḍi* of the South. Another interpretation is also possible. *Kumārāmātya* may mean an *amātya* from one's youth just as *Kumāra-sevaka* means *ākaumāraparichārakah*

officials like the *Mahāsāmiyas* who preserved records,[1] and others whose exact functions and status are nowhere indicated. Amongst these may be mentioned the *Abhyamtaropasthāyaka*, 'servant of the interior (harem ?),' *Māḍabika*,[2] *Tūthika* and *Neyika*.[3]

The big empires of North Western India were split up into vast satrapies and smaller provinces ruled by *Mahākshatrapas* and *Kshatrapas*. The satrapies as well as the kingdoms outside the limits of the Scythian Empire, were divided into districts called *Rāshṭra*, *Āhāra*, *Janapada*, *Deśa* or *Vishaya*. We do not as yet hear of the organisation into *Bhuktis* (*lit.* allotments, administrative divisions) so widely prevalent in Post-Scythian times. *Rāshṭra*, *Āhāra* (or *Hāra*) and *Janapada* seem to have been synonymous terms in this age, as is proved by the case of the Sātahani-*raṭṭha* (*rāshṭra*) or Sātavāhani-*hāra* which is styled a *janapada* in the Myakadoni Inscription. The chief officer in a *Rāshṭra* or *Āhāra* was the *Rāshṭrapati*, *Rāshṭrika* (*Raṭhika*) or *Amātya*. The *Amātya Suviśākha*, for instance, governed Surāshṭra under the *Mahākshatrapa* Rudradāman. The *Amātyas* Vishnupālita, Śyāmaka, and Śiva-skanda-datta successively governed the *Āhāra* or district of Govardhana (Nāsik) in the time of Gautamîputra Śātakarṇi and Pulumāyi, while the neighbouring *Āhāra* of Māmāla (Poona District) was under an *Amātya* whose name ended in—Gupta. In the Far South the chief officer of the *Āhāra* seems to have been called '*Vyāpṛita*.'[4] The *Janapadas*, particularly those on vulnerable frontiers, were sometimes placed under the charge of military governors (*Strategos*, *Mahāsenāpati*, *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, etc.). The *Janapada* of Śātavāhani-

[1] For another interpretation see *JBBRAS*, N.S., IV, 1928, pp. 64, 72; *IHQ*, 1933, 221. In the opinion of V. S Bakhle the *Mahāsāmiya* "seems to refer to the resolution of the corporate assembly of the city or to that body itself."

[2] The word *Māḍabika* may perhaps be connected with *Māḍamba* of the Jaina *Kalpasūtra*, 89. Para. 62 refers to an official styled *Māḍambiya* (Burgomaster). For a tax *Maṇḍapikā* see *Ep. Ind.*, XXIII, 137.

[3] Sircar equates *Neyika* with *Naiyogika*.

[4] Lüders, 1327, 1328.

hāra was, for instance, under the *Mahāsenāpati* Skandanāga.[1] Part of Eastern Malwa seems to have been governed by a Śaka *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* shortly before its annexation by the Imperial Guptas and portions of the Indian borderland, were governed by a line of *Strategoi* (Aspavarman, Sasa)[2] under Azes and Gondophernes.

Deśa, too, is often used as a synonym of *Rāshṭra*, or *Janapada*. It was under a *Deśādhikṛita*, the *Deshmukh* of mediaeval times, an officer mentioned in the Hīrahaḍagalli grant of Śiva-Skanda-varman. The next smaller unit was apparently the *Vishaya* governed by the *Vishayapati*.[3] But sometimes even '*Vishaya* was used as a synonym of *Deśa* or *Rāshṭra*, and there were cases in the Post-Gupta period of the use of the term to designate a larger area than a *Rāshṭra*.[4]

The smallest administrative units were the villages called *Grāma* or *Grāmāhāra*,[5] and the smaller towns or emporia called *Nigama*[6] The affairs of a Grāma were controlled by officers styled *Grāmeyika Āyutta*[7] who were apparently headed by the *Grāmaṇī*,[8] *Grāmika*[9] *Grāma-bhojaka*[10] or (*Grāma*) *Mahattaraka* Lüders' (Mathurā) Inscription, No. 48, gives the names of two such *Grāmikas*, Jayadeva and Jayanāga. In Southern India we have the curious title "*Muluḍa*" applied to the head of a village.[11] The chief men of the *Nigamas* were the *Gahapatis*,[12] the

[1] *Cf.* the Myakadoni Inscription.

[2] For an *amātya* named Sasa, see the Kodavali Rock Inscription of the Sātavāhana king Siri Chamda Sāti or Sāta (Ep. Ind., XVIII, 318)

[3] 920n (Luders).

[4] Fleet, *CII*, 32 n.

[5] Luders, *Ins*, No. 1195.

[6] In Pali literature *Nigamas* are distinguished from *grāmas*, villages, as well as from *nagaras*, cities which had strong ramparts and gateways (*dridha prākāra toraṇa*).

[7] 1327.

[8] 1333.

[9] 48,69a.

[10] 1200.

[11] *Ins*, 1194. Cf. *Muruṇḍa*=lord (Śaka) For the presence of Śakas in the Far South, see *Ep. Ind.*, XX, 37.

[12] *Gahapati*, house-lord, was a designation specially applied to the leading men of the gentry, the wealthy middle class, *Kalyāna-bhattiko*, men accustomed

counterparts of the *Grāmavṛiddhas* of villages. In Lüders' Inscription, No. 1153, we have evidence of the corporate activity of a *dhamma-nigama* headed by the *Gahapati*. The *Grāma* and *Nigama* organisation was the most durable part of the Ancient Indian system of government, and centuries of Scythian rule could not wipe it out of existence. The village and the *Nigamas* were also the nurseries of those ideas of associate life which found vent in the organisation of societies, committees, assemblies and corporations styled *Goshṭhīs*,[1] *Nikāyas*,[2] *Parishads*,[3] *Saṅghas*,[4] etc., about which the inscriptions of the period speak so much. Not the least interesting of these institutions was the "*Goshṭhī*" which afforded a field for co-operation between kings and villagers. Lüders' Ins., Nos. 1332 to 1338, speak of a *Goshṭhī* which was headed by the *Rājan*, and which counted among its officials the son of a village headman.

A less pleasing feature of ancient Indian polity in the Scythian, as in other times, was the employment of spies, particularly of the "*Saṁcharantakas*," or wandering emissaries, whose functions are described with gruesome details in the *Arthaśāstra*. The evidence of foreign witnesses in Maurya and Gupta periods seems, however, to suggest that political morality did not actually sink so low as a study of the *Arthaśāstra* would lead us to think. Vatsyāyana probably voices the real feelings of his countrymen when he says that every single maxim for which there is provision in a theoretical treatise need not be followed in actual practice, because theoretical manuals have to be comprehensive, but practical application should have a limited range. No sane man will think of eating dog's flesh simply because its flavour, tonic power, dressing, etc., are discussed in medical treatises.

to a good dietary. They are often distinguished from priests and nobles (Rhys Davids and Stede).

[1] Lüders' *Ins.*, 273, 1332, 1335, 1338

[2] 1133

[3] 125, 925

[4] 5, 1137.

Na śāstramastītye tāvat prayoge kāranaṁ bhavet
śāstrārthān vyāpino vidyāt prayogāṁstvekadeśikān
rasa-vīrya vipākā hi śvamāṁsasyāpi vaidyake
kīrtitā iti tat kiṁ syād bhakshaṇīyaṁ vichakshaṇaiḥ

CHAPTER X. THE GUPTA EMPIRE: THE RISE OF THE GUPTA POWER.

Imāṁ sāgaraparyantām Himavad-Vindhya-kuṇḍalām
mahīm ekātapatrāṅkāṁ Rājasiṁha[1] *praśāstu naḥ*
—*Dūtavākyam.*

SECTION I. THE FOUNDATION OF THE GUPTA DYNASTY

We have seen that the tide of Scythian conquest, which was rolled back for a time by the Śātavāhanas, was finally stemmed by the Gupta Emperors. It is interesting to note that there were many Guptas among the officials of the Śātavāhana conquerors of the Śakas *e.g.*, Śiva Gupta of the Nāsik Inscription of the year 18, (Pura or Puru?) Gupta of the Karle Inscription, and Śiva-Skanda Gupta of the same epigraph. It is difficult to say whether there was any connection between these Guptas and the Imperial Gupta family of Northern India, two of whom actually bore the names of Skanda Gupta and Puru Gupta.[2]

[1] With *Rājasiṁha* may be compared the epithet *Narendrasiṁha* occurring on coins of Chandra Gupta II (Allan, *Gupta Coins*, 43). All the letters here are not clearly legible (*ibid.*, cxiii), but on many coins we find the analogous epithet *Siṁha-vikrama* (pp. 38 ff.). The reference in the *Dūtavākya* must be to a paramount ruler of Northern India, bounded by the seas and the Himālayan and Vindhyan ranges, who had the epithet 'lion-like king'. The ruler who answers best to the description is Chandra Gupta II The author of the *Dūtavākya* possibly refers to this monarch. If he is identical with Bhāsa, a distinguished predecessor of Kālidāsa, his career as a poet may have begun before the accession of Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, 'Narendra-Siṁha'. *i.e.*, in the time of the great patron and 'king of poets' (*Kavirāja*) Samudra Gupta.

[2] In the *Modern Review* (November), 1929, p. 499 f., it has been suggested that the Guptas are of *Kāraskara* origin. But the evidence on the point is hardly conclusive. The identification of the "accursed" Chaṇḍasena of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* (adopted son of Sundaravarman), whose family was uprooted (p. 500) with Chandra Gupta I, son of *Mahārāja Śrī* Ghaṭotkacha whose dynasty ruled gloriously for centuries, is clearly untenable. The mere fact that Lichchhavis helped Chaṇḍasena is not enough to prove that the prince in question is identical with Chandra Gupta I. Lichchhavis appear as enemies of Magadha as early as the fifth century B.C. For a summary of the

Scions of the Gupta family are not unoften mentioned in old *Brāhmī* Inscriptions The Ichchhāwar[1] Buddhist Statuette Inscription[2] mentions the benefaction of Mahādevî, queen of Srî Haridāsa, sprung from the Gupta race *(Gupta-vaṁśodita)*. A Bharhut Buddhist Pillar Inscription[3] of the Śuṅga period refers to a "Gaupti" as the queen of *Rājan* Visadeva, and the grandmother of Dhanabhūti, probably a feudatory of the Śuṅgas.

Traces of "Gupta" rule in Magadha proper, or some neighbouring tract down the Ganges, are found as early as the second century A.D. I-Tsing, a Chinese pilgrim, who travelled in India in the seventh century A.D., mentions a Mahārāja **Sri Gupta** who built a temple *near* Mṛigasikhāvana "which was about forty yojanas to the east of Nālandā, following the course of the Ganges."[4] I-Tsing's date would place him about A.D. 175.[5] Allan rejects the date, and identifies Śrī Gupta, with Gupta the great-grandfather of Samudra Gupta, on the ground that it is unlikely that we should have two different rulers in the same territory, of the same name, within a brief period.

plot of the drama, which is attributed by some to a female writer, see *Aiyangar Com. Vol.* 361f. If Sundaravarman, and his son Kalyānavarman are real historical figures, and if they actually ruled over Magadha, they must be placed either before *Mahārāja Śrī* Gupta or after Bālāditya (6th century A.D.). The memory of Varman *ādhipatya* over Magadha was fresh at the time of the Sirpur Stone Inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta (*Ep. Ind.*, XI, 191). *Cf.* also Pūrnavarman and Devavarman mentioned by Chinese writers, as well as kings of the Maukhari line. The origin of the Imperial Gupta family is wrapped up in obscurity. We only know that they probably belonged to the *Dhāraṇa* gotra (IHQ, 1930, 565). They may have been related to Queen Dhārinī, the chief consort of Agnimitra. Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out (IHQ, 1933, 930 ff.) that according to a Javanese text (*Tantri Kāmandaka*) *Māhārāja* Aiśvaryapāla of the Ikshvāku race traced his genealogy to the family of Samudra Gupta. Little reliance can, however, be placed on the uncorroborated assertions of late writers. Even more unreliable is the testimony of works like the *Bhavishyottara Purāṇa* which, according to some critics, 'is a palpable modern forgery' (NHIP, VI. 133n). Cf. *Proceedings of the I. H. Congress*, 1944, pp. 119 ff.

[1] Bāndā District.

[2] Lüders, No. 11.

[3] Lüders, No. 687.

[4] Dr. Majumdar in *A New History of the Indian People*, VI, 129; Dr. C. Ganguli, IHQ, XIV (1938), 532.

[5] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, Introduction, p. xv. Cf. *Ind. Ant.*, X (1881), 110.

But have we not two Chandra Guptas and two Kumāra Guptas within brief periods? There is no cogent reason for identifying Śrī Gupta of *cir.* A.D. 175, known to tradition, with Samudra Gupta's great-grandfather who must have flourished about a century later.

The names of Śrī Gupta's immediate successors are not known. The earliest name of a member of the Gupta family of Magadha which appears in inscriptions is that of *Mahārāja* **Gupta** who was succeeded by his son *Mahārāja* **Ghaṭotkacha.**

SECTION II. CHANDRA GUPTA I.

The first independent sovereign (*Mahārājādhirāja*)[1] of the line was Chandra Gupta I, son of Ghaṭotkacha, who *may have* ascended the throne in 320 A.D., the initial date of the Gupta Era.[2] Like his great fore-runner Bimbisāra he strengthened his position at some stage of his career, by a matrimonial alliance with the Lichchhavis of Vaiśālī or of Nepāl,[3] and laid the foundations of the Second Magadhan Empire. The union of Chandra Gupta I with the Lichchhavi family is commemorated by a series of coins[4] having on the obverse standing figures of Chandra Gupta and his queen, the Lichchhavi princess Kumāradevī, and

[1] In the Riddhapur plates (JASB, 1924, 58), however, Chandra Gupta I and even Samudra Gupta are called (carelessly) simply *Mahārājas*.

[2] JRAS, 1893, 80; Cunningham, Arch. Sur. Rep., Vol. IX, p. 21. The identity of the Gupta king with whom the era (*Gupta prakāla, Guptānaṁ kāla*) of 320 A.D. originated, is by no means clear. The claims of Mahārāja Gupta (IHQ, 1942, 273 n) or even (less plausibly) of Samudra Gupta, cannot be altogether disregarded.

[3] It is *not* suggested that the marriage took place *after* 320 A.D. The chronology of the Guptas before A.D. 380 is still in a stage of uncertainty. Nothing definite can be stated about the relative date of the marriage till we know more about the length of Chandragupta I's reign, and the exact date of his accession, and that of his son and successor, Samudra Gupta. Some scholars think that Chandragupta I's alliance was with the ruling family of Nepāl (JRAS, 1889, p. 55) or of Pāṭaliputra (JRAS, 1893, p. 81).

[4] There is difference of opinion among scholars regarding the attribution of these coins, see Altekar in *Num. Suppl.* No. XLVII, *JRASB*, III (1937), No. 2,546. It is difficult to come to any final conclusion till the discovery of coins whose attribution to Chandragupta I is beyond doubt.

on the reverse a figure of Lakshmī, the goddess of luck with the legend "*Lichchhavayaḥ*" probably signifying that the prosperity of Chandra Gupta was due to his Lichchhavi alliance. Smith suggests that the Lichchhavis were ruling in Pāṭaliputra as tributaries or feudatories of the Kushāns and that through his marriage Chandra Gupta succeeded to the power of his wife's relatives. But Allan suggests that Pāṭaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Śrî Gupta's time.[1]

From the record of Samudra Gupta's conquests it has been deduced that his father's rule was confined to Magadha and the adjoining territories. In the opinion of Allan the Purāṇic verses defining the Gupta dominions refer to his reign:

Anu-Gaṅgā-Prayāgaṁcha Sāketam Magadhāṁstathā
Etān janapadān sarvān bhokshyante Guptavaṁśajāḥ.

"Kings born of the Gupta family will enjoy all these territories *viz.*, Prayāga (Allahabad) on the Ganges,[2] Sāketa (Oudh), and Magadha (South Bihār)."

It will be seen that Vaiśālî (North Bihār) is not included in this list of Gupta possessions. Therefore, it is difficult to concur in Allan's view that Vaiśālî was one of Chandra Gupta's earliest conquests. Nor does Vaiśālî occur in the list of Samudra Gupta's acquisitions, though the reference to Nepāl as a border state in the famous Allahabad inscription may suggest that North Bihār was included within his dominions. It first appears definitely as a Gupta possession in the time of Chandra Gupta II, and constituted a viceroyalty under an imperial Prince. Prayāga (Allahabad) may have been conquered from a line of kings whose existence is disclosed in certain inscriptions

[1] Kielhorn's North Indian Inscription, No. 541, however, suggests some connection between the Lichchhavis and Pushpapura (Pāṭaliputra).

[2] Cf. *Anu-Gangaṁ Hāstinapuram, Anu-Gaṅgam Vārānasī, Anu-Śoṇam Pāṭaliputram*—Patañjali, II. 1. 2.

discovered at Bhīṭā.[1] Two of these kings, Mahārāja Gautamîputra Śrî Śivamagha and Rājan Vāsishṭhîputra Bhīmasena are assigned by Marshall to the second or third century A.D. The name Śivamegha (or Śivamagha) reminds us of the 'Meghas' (Maghas) who ruled in Kosalâ in the third century A.D.[2] Another king, Mahārāja Gautamîputra Vṛishadhvaja, is assigned to the third or fourth century A.D.

One of the most memorable acts of Chandra Gupta I was the selection, before the assembled councillors (*Sabhyas*) and princes of the blood, of Samudra Gupta as his successor.

SECTION III. SAMUDRA GUPTA PARĀKRAMĀṄKA[3]

The exact date when Chandra Gupta I was succeeded by his son, Samudra Gupta, is not known. If the evidence of the spurious Nālandā plate (issued from Nṛipura) has any value the event may have happened before the year 5 of the Gupta Era, *i.e.*, A.D. 325. But this is doubtful. It is clear not only from the Allahabad *Praśasti* but from the epithet "*tatpādaparigṛihīta*," applied to Samudra Gupta in the Ṛiddhapur inscription, that the prince was selected from among his sons by Chandra Gupta I as best fitted to succeed him. The new monarch may have been known also as Kācha.[4]

[1] And Bandhogarh (Rewa)—*Amrita Bazar Patrika*, 11-10-38, p. 2; *NHIP*, VI, 41 ff. The *Magha* kings are also known from coins (Fatehpur hoard).

[2] JRAS, 1911, 132; Pargiter, DKA, p. 51; see also a note on the *Kosam Stone Inscription of Mahārāja Bhīmavarman*, by Mr. A. Ghosh in *Indian Culture*, *III*, 1936, 177 ff, see also *IC*, I. 694, 715.

[3] The titles *Parākrama*, *Vyāghraparākrama*, and *Parākramāṅka* are found on coins (Allan, *Catalogue*, pp. cxi, 1f) and in the Allahabad *Praśasti* (CII, p. 6). Recently a coin has been found with the legend *Śrī Vikramaḥ* on the reverse (Bamnālā hoard, Nimar district, *J. Num. Soc. Ind.*, Vol. V, pt. 2, p. 140, December, 1943).

[4] The epithet *Sarva-rājo-chchhettā* found on Kācha's coins shows that he was in all probability identical with Samudra Gupta. *Cf.* Smith, *Catalogue*, 96; IA, 1902, 259f. For another view see Smith, JRAS, 1897, 19; Rapson, JRAS, 1893, 81; Heras, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol IX, p. 83f. To us it is unthinkable that the style "uprooter of all kings" could have been assumed by a Gupta monarch other than the one who is

It was the aim of Samudra Gupta to bring about the political unification of India (*dharani-bandha*) and make himself an *Ekarāṭ* or sole ruler like Mahāpadma. But his only permanent annexation was that of portions of *Āryāvarta* in the upper valley of the Ganges and its tributaries, together with certain districts in Central and Eastern India. Following his "*Sarvakshatrāntaka*"[1] predecessor, this *Sarva-rājo-chchhettā*, "exterminator of all kings," uprooted Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Gaṇapati Nāga, Nāgasena, Achyuta, Nandi, Balavarman, and many other **kings of Āryāvarta**,[2] captured the scion of the **family of Kota** and made all the kings of forest countries (*āṭavika-rāja*) his servants. Rudradeva has been identified by Mr. Dikshit with Rudrasena Vākāṭaka. But the Vākāṭakas can hardly be regarded as rulers of Āryāvarta, and they were far from being uprooted in the time of Samudra Gupta.[3] Equally untenable is the identification of Balavarman with a prince of Assam, a province that was then looked upon as a border state (*Pratyanta*) and not as a part of Āryāvarta. Matila has been identified with a person named "Mattila" mentioned in a seal found in Bulandshahr in the **Central Doāb.** The absence of any honorific

actually credited with that achievement by a contemporary inscription, before the events presupposed by the expression had actually happened. In the Poona plates we find the epithet applied to Chandra Gupta II, son of Samudra Gupta, along with many other designations of the latter. But it should be remembered that the plates in question are not official records of the Guptas themselves. In no official epigraph of the Imperial Guptas is the style "*Sarva-rājo-chchhettā*" applied to any other king except Samudra Gupta. The application of the term to Chandra Gupta II in the Poona Plates is due to the same carelessness which led the writer to describe Chandra Gupta I as a mere *Mahārāja* (and not *Mahārājādhirāja*). A comparison of the Āmgāchhi record with the Bāṇagaḍ Inscription shows that writers of *Praśastis* not unoften carelessly applied to a later king eulogies really pertaining to a preceding ruler.

[1] Destroyer of all Kshatriyas, an epithet of Mahāpadma.

[2] Father Heras thinks (*Ann. Bhan. Ins.*, IX, p. 88) that Samudra Gupta undertook two campaigns in *Āryāvarta*. But his theory involves the assumption that Achyuta and Nāgasena were "violently exterminated" in the second campaign after being "uprooted" in the first. To obviate the difficulty he takes "uprooted" to mean "defeated". This is, to say the least, unconvincing.

[3] *Cf.* IHQ, I, 2, 254. Rudrasena is connected with Deotek in the Chanda Dist. of C.P. *Eighth Or. Conf.* 613 ff. *Ep. Ind.*, xxvi. 147, 150.

title on the seal leads Allan to suggest that it was a private one. But we have already come across several instances of princes being mentioned without any honorific. Chandravarman has been identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Susunia[1] inscription, who was the ruler of Pushkaraṇa and was possibly the founder of Chandravarman-koṭa mentioned in the Ghugrahāṭī grant. Some scholars identify Pushkaraṇa with Pokran or Pokurna in Mārwār, and further equate Siṁhavarman, the name of the father of Chandravarman, with Siṁhavarman of the Mandasor family. But there is very little to be said in support of this conjecture. No mention of Chandravarman, or reference to his exploits, is found in any epigraphic record of the Varman family of Western Mālwa. Pushkaraṇa is really to be identified with a village named Pokharan on the Dāmodar river in the **Bankura** District, some 25 miles to the north-east of Susunia Hill.[2]

[1] "A sandstone hill 12 miles to the north-west of Bankura."

[2] *Cf.* Dikshit, *ASI, AR*, 1927-28, p. 188; S. K. Chatterji, *"The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language,"* II, 1061; IHQ. I, 2. 255. Paṇḍit H. P. Śāstrī believed that this local ruler who bore the modest title of *Mahārāja* was identical also with the mighty emperor (*bhūmipati prāpta aikādhirājya*) Chandra of the Meharauli Iron Pillar Inscription who "in battle in the Vaṅga countries turned back with his breast the enemies who uniting together came against him and by whom having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the Indus the Vāhlikas were conquered." Others suggest the identification of the great Chandra with one or other of the famous Chandra Gupta as of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty. But Chandra is never styled either Chandravarman or Chandra Gupta and, unlike the court poets of the Varmans and Guptas, the panegyrist of the mighty Chandra, who is said to have carried his arms to the distant corners of India, never gives the slightest hint about his pedigree. He does not even mention the name of his father. It may be noted here that the *Purāṇas* represent the Nāgas as ruling in the Jumna Valley and Central India early in the fourth century A.D. We learn from the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* that Nāga dynasties ruled at Padmāvatī and Mathurā. A Nāga line probably ruled also at Vidiśā (Pargiter, *Kali Age*, p. 49). Two kings named Sadā-Chandra and Chandrāṁśa, "the second Nakhavant," are mentioned among the post-Andhran kings of Nāga lineage. One of these, preferably the latter, who was obviously a ruler of note, may have been the Chandra of the Meharauli Inscription. The Vāhlikas beyond "the seven mouths of the Indus" are apparently the Baktrioi occupying the country near Arachosia in the time of the geographer Ptolemy (*Ind. Ant.*, 1884, p. 408). An inscription of *Mahārājādhirāja Śrī* Chandra has been discovered on a Jaina image at Vaibhāra hill (ASI, AR, 1925-26, p. 125). The identity of this Chandra is not clear.

Ganapati Nāga, Nāgasena and Nandi seem to have been Nāga princes. That Ganapati Nāga was a Nāga prince is evident. This ruler is also known from coins found at **Mathurā**[1] at Pawāyā near Narwar and at Besnagar.[2] Nāgasena, who met his doom at **Padmāvati**[3] near Narwar on the Sindh river between Gwalior and Jhansi, is mentioned as a scion of the Nāga family in the *Harshacharita* (*Nāga-kula-janmanaḥ sārikāśrāvita mantrasya āsīdnāśo Nāgasenasya Padmāvatyām*.[4] Nandi was also probably a Nāga prince. In the *Purāṇas* Siśu Nandi and Nandiyaśas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know also the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanandi.[5] Achyuta was probably a king of **Ahichchhatrā,** modern Rāmanagar in the Bareilly District. To him has been attributed the small copper coins bearing the syllables '*achyu*' found at Ahichchhatrā.[6] As to the *Kota-kula* Rapson[7] draws our attention to certain coins bearing the inscription *Kota*. These resemble the "Śruta coins" attributed to a ruler of **Śrāvastī** and should apparently be referred to the upper Gangetic region.[8]

[1] Altekar, *NHIP*, vi, 37.

[2] IHQ, I, 2, 255. Note the importance of the name of this king from the point of view of religious history. Cf. *Gajamukha* of the *Bṛhat Saṁhitā*, 58 58. A reference to king Ganapati Nāga in the *Bhāva Śataka*, a late work, is more than doubtful. *Gajavaktra Śrī* of that work is a misreading for *Gata Vaktra Śrī* (IHQ, 1936, 135 ff *Kāvyamālā*, IV, pp. 46 f, 60).

[3] Padamāvatī—"Padam Pawāyā (25 miles N-E of Narwar) in the apex of the confluence of the Sindhu and the Pārā. Nāga coins have been found here, also a palmleaf capital with an inscription of the first and second century B.C." EHI[4], p. 300, ASI, AR, 1915-16, pp. 101 ff.

[4] "In Padmāvatī Nāgasena, born in the Nāga family, whose confidential deliberations were divulged by a *sārikā* bird, met his doom."

[5] Dubreuil, *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 31. It is interesting to note that Garuḍa was the emblem of the Gupta kings who did much to curb the power of the Nāgas. *Cf.* the passage of the Junāgaḍh Inscription of Skanda Gupta:

Narapati bhujagānām mānadarpot phanānām
pratikṛti Garuḍājñām nirvishīm chāvakartā

In the Purāṇas Kṛishṇa, the deity honoured by the Guptas, crushes the head of the serpent, *nāga*, Kāliya.

[6] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, xxii; *CCAI*, lxxix.

[7] JRAS, 1898, 449 f.

[8] Smith (*Coins in the Indian Museum*, 258) points out that the Kota coins are common in the Eastern Pañjāb and the Delhi bazaar. A Kota tribe is

The conquered territories were constituted as *Vishayas* or Imperial sub-provinces. Two of these *vishayas* are known from later inscriptions of the family, namely, Antarvedī or the Gangetic Doāb and **Airikiṇa** in Eastern Mālwa. It is significant that a **Nāga** styled the *Vishaya-pati* Śarva-nāga, figures as a ruler of **Antarvedī** as late as the time of Skanda Gupta.

The annexation of the northern kingdom named above was not the only achievement of Samudra Gupta. He made the rulers of the *Āṭavika rājyas*, or forest states, his servants. But his most daring exploit was an expedition to the south, which made his power felt by the potentates of the Eastern Deccan. We perceive, however, a difference between his northern and southern campaigns. In the north he played the part of a "*digvijayī*" or "conqueror of the quarters," of the Early Magadhan type.[1] But in the south he followed the Epic and Kauṭilyan ideal of a "*dharmavijayī*" or "righteous conqueror," *i.e.*, he defeated the kings but did not annex their territory. He may have realised the futility of attempting to maintain effective control over these distant regions in the south from his remote base in the north-east of India. His successor tried to maintain his hold on the Deccan by a system of marriage alliances.

The **Āṭavika** *rājyas* undoubtedly included the realm of Ālavaka (Ghāzipur) as well as the forest kingdoms

said to exist also in the Nilgiris (JRAS, 1897, 863; Ind. Ant., iii, 36, 96, 205). The passage in the Allahabad Inscription that "Samudra Gupta caused the scion of the Kota family to be captured by his armies and took pleasure at Pushpāhvaya" has been taken by some scholars to suggest that the *Kotas* were at the time the ruling family of Pāṭaliputra (*cf.* Jayaswal, *History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.*, p. 113). The identification of the *Kota kula*, with the *Māgadha family* of the *Kaumudī-mahotsava* lacks proof.

[1] This kind of *Vijaya* or conquest is termed *Asura-vijaya* "demon's conquest" in the *Arthaśāstra* (p. 382). The name may have been derived from the Assyrians, the ruthlessness of whose warfare is well known. For a discussion regarding the possible derivation of Asura from Aśśur, see *JRAS*, 1916, 355; 1924, 265ff. Conquest of this type is first met with in India in the sixth century B.C. (*cf.* Ajātaśatru's subjugation of the Lichchhavis and Viḍuḍabha's conquest of the Śākyas) when Persia served as a link between Assyria and India.

connected with **Dabhālā** or the Jabbalpur territory.[1] The conquest of this region by Samudra Gupta is suggested also by his Eraṇ inscription.

The **Kings of Dakshiṇāpatha** who came into conflict with the great Gupta were Mahendra of Kosala, Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra, Maṇṭarāja of Kaurāla, Svāmidatta of Koṭṭūra, a chieftain of Pishṭapura whose precise name is uncertain,[2] Damana of Eraṇḍapalla, Vishṇugopa of Kāñchī, Nīlarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Veṅgī, Ugrasena of Palakka, Kubera of Devarāshṭra, Dhanaṁjaya of Kusthalapura and others.

Kosala in *Dakshiṇāpatha*, i.e., South Kosala, comprised the modern Bilāspur, Raipur and Sambalpur districts, and occasionally possibly even a part of Gañjām.[3] Its capital was Śrīpura, the modern Sirpur; about forty miles east by north from Raipur.[4] Mahākāntāra is apparently a wild tract of the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradeśa) which probably included Kāntāra which the *Mahābhārata* places between Veṇvātaṭa (the valley of the Waingaṅgā) and Prāk-Kosala, the eastern part of Kosala mentioned above.[5]

[1] Fleet, CII, p. 114; *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, 284-287. In the latter part of the fifth and early part of the sixth century A.D., the Dabhālā country was governed by the *Parivrājaka Mahārājas* as feudatories of the Guptas. The *Mbh.* ii. 31, 13-15, like the Allahabad Praśasti, distinguishes the Āṭavikas from the Kāntārakas. One of the Āṭavika states may have been Koṭāṭavi mentioned in the commentary on the *Rāma-charita* of Sandhyākara Nandi (p. 36). In one epigraphic record, *Ep. Ind.*, VII, p. 126, we have a reference to a place called Vaṭāṭavi, while another, Lüder's List, No. 1195, mentions Sahalāṭavi.

[2] For the various interpretations of the passage "*Paishṭpuraka Mahendragiri Kauṭṭūraka Svāmidatta,*" see Fleet, CII, Vol. 3, p. 7; JRAS, 1897, pp. 420, 868-870; IHQ, 1925, 252; Barua, *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions*, 224. It is not improbable that Mahendragiri in this passage is a personal name. *Cf.* the name Kumāra-giri given to a chief of Koṇḍaviḍu whose territories included a portion at least of the Godāvarī district (Kielhorn, S. Ins., 596). In JRAS, 1897, 870, we have reference to Kamtagir, an ally of Sindhia.

[3] Inclusion of Ratnapur, *Ep. Ind.*, X, 26; of Koṅgoda, *Ep. Ind.*, VI, 141, unless Kosala is a misreading for Tosala.

[4] Fleet, CII, p. 293. Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, xxiii, 118 f

[5] Mbh. II, 31, 12-13, G. Ramdas (IHQ, I, 4, 684) identifies Mahākāntāra with the 'Jhāḍ-khaṇḍ' Agency tracts of Gañjām and Vizagapatam. The sway of the rājā of Mahākāntāra or "Greater Kāntāra", may have extended northwards as far as Nachna in the Ajaygarh (not Jaso) state (Smith, JRAS, 1914, 320). The identification of many of the southern kingdoms suggested by Mr. R. Sathianathaier (in his *Studies in the Ancient History of Toṇḍamaṇḍa-*

Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or Colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Veṅgī mentioned separately. Dr. Barnett suggests its identification with one of the villages that now bears the name Korāḍa[1] in South India. There is a place named Kolāḍa near Russelkonda in Gañjām.

Koṭṭūra has been identified with Kothoor, 12 miles south-east of Mahendragiri in Gañjām.[2] Pishṭapura is Piṭhāpuram in the Godāvarî district. Eraṇḍapalla is identified by Fleet with Eraṇḍol in Khandesh, and by Dubreuil with Eraṇḍapali, "a town probably near Chicacole" in the Gañjām district.[3] But G. Ramdas[4] suggests the identification of Eraṇḍapalla with Yeṇḍipalli in Vizagapatam or Eṇḍapilli in Ellore Tāluk. Kāñchî is Conjeeveram near Madras. Avamukta cannot be satisfactorily identified. But the name of its king Nîlarāja reminds us of Nîlapalli, "an old seaport near Yanam" in the Godāvarî district.[5] Veṅgī has been identified with Vegi or Pedda-Vegi, 7 miles north of Ellore between the Krishṇā and the Godāvarî. Its king Hastivarman was identified by Hultzsch with Attivarman (of the Ānanda family).[6] But the more probable view is that he belonged to the Śālaṅ-

lam) does not carry conviction. His conclusion that Samudra Gupta "first emerged on the east coast at Piṭhāpuram and conquered the Western Deccan" is based upon evidence that is clearly inadequate.

[1] *Cal. Rev.*, Feb., 1924, 253 n. *Cf.* Kuṛṛālam, Tj. 590 (*A Topographical List of Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency,* by V. Rangacharya). The identification with Yayātinagarī (*Ep. Ind.*, XI. 189), which Dhoyi connects with the sports of the Keralīs, was suggested in some editions of this work. But the reading Keralī in the *Pavanadūta* is not beyond doubt. For Kolāḍa see *Ep. Ind*, XIX. 42.

[2] There is another Koṭṭura 'at the foot of the Hills' in the Vizagapatam district (Vizag., District Gaz., I. 157). See also Koṭṭūru (IA, 4, 329) and Kottūrnāḍu, MS. 333, Rangacharya's List.

[3] Dubreuil, AHD, pp. 58-60. A place called Eraṇḍavallī is mentioned in an inscription of Govinda III (*Bhārata Itihāsa Sam. Maṇḍala*, AR, XVI).

[4] IHQ, 1, 4, p. 683. There is an Eraṇḍī *tīrtha in Pādma*, Svarga khaṇḍa, 45, 57, 61.

[5] Gazetteer of the Godāvarî District, Vol. I, p. 213. Curiously enough, the *Brahma Purāṇa* (ch. 113, 22f) mentions an *Avimukta-kshetra* on the bank of the Gautamî, *i.e.*, the Godāvarî. *Cf.* Avimukteśvara, Anantapur, 164 of Rangacharya's List.

[6] Attivarman was wrongly assigned to the Pallava race. *Cf.* IHQ, 1, 2,

kāyana dynasty.[1] Palakka is probably identical with Palakkada, (or Pālatkaṭa) a Pallava royal residence or seat of a viceroy in Guntur or Nellore in South India. Allan and G. Ramdas locate it in the Nellore district.[2] Devarāshṭra is the Yellamañchili tāluk of the Vizagapatam district.[3] Kusthalapura is, according to Dr. Barnett, probably Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot.[4]

The capture and liberation of the southern kings, notably of the ruler of Koṭṭūra near Mt. Mahendragiri remind us of the following lines of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśam*:—

Gṛihīta-pratimuktasya sa dharma-vijayî nṛipaḥ
Śriyaṁ Mahendra-nāthasya jahāra natu medinîṁ

"The righteous conqueror (Raghu) took away from the lord of the Mahendra Mountain, who was made captive and then released, his glory but not his territory."

It is not a little surprising that the Allahabad *Praśasti* contains no clear reference to the **Vākāṭakas** who are known to have dominated part of the region between Bundelkhand and the Pengaṅgā in the fifth century A.D. The earliest reference to the Vākāṭakas occurs in certain inscriptions of Amarāvatî.[5] The dynasty rose to power under Vindhyaśakti I and his son Pravarasena I. Pravarasena appears to have been succeeded in the northern part of his dominions by his grandson Rudrasena I. Pṛithivishena I, the son and successor of Rudrasena I, may have been a contemporary of Samudra Gupta and perhaps also of his son Chandragupta II, inasmuch as his son Rudrasena

p. 253; *Ind. Ant.*, IX, 102. But he is actually described as born in the lineage of the great saint Ānanda (*Bomb. Gaz.*, I. ii. 334; Kielhorn, S. Ins., 1015; IA. IX, 102; ASI. 1924-25, p. 118).

[1] The name Hastivarman is actually found in a Śālaṅkāyana *Vaṁśāvali* (IHQ, 1927, 429; 1933, 212; Pedavegi plates of Nandivarman II).

[2] IHQ, I, 2, 686. *Cf. Ep. Ind.*, xxiv, 140.

[3] Dubreuil, AHD, p. 160; ASR, 1908-09, p. 123; 1934-35, 43, 65.

[4] *Cal. Rev.*, 1924, p. 253 n. *Cf.* Kutalaparru, MS, 179 of Rangacharya's List.

[5] Ep. Ind., XV, pp. 261, 267.

II married the daughter of the last-mentioned Gupta emperor. Prithivishena I's political influence extended over a fairly wide territory. The Nach-nē-kî-talāî and Ganj regions[1] were in all probability ruled by *his* vassal Vyāghra-deva. Professor Dubreuil, however, says that the Nāchnā and Ganj inscriptions, which mention Vyāghra, belong, not to Prithivishena I, but to his great-great-grandson Prithivishena II. This is improbable in view of the fact that from the time of Prithivishena II's great-grandfather, if not from a period still earlier, down to at least A.D. 528, the princes of the region which intervenes between Nāchnā and Ganj and the proper Vākāṭaka territory,[2] owned the sway of the Gupta empire. Now as Vyāghra of the Nāchnā and Ganj records acknowledges the supremacy of the Vākāṭaka Prithivishena, this Prithivishena can only be Prithivishena I, who ruled before the establishment of the Gupta supremacy in Central India by Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II[3] and not Prithivishena II during whose rule the Guptas, and not the Vākāṭakas, were apparently the acknowledged suzerains of the Madhya Pradeśa as we learn from the records of the Parivrājaka *Mahārājas*.[4]

The absence of any clear reference to Prithivishena I in Harishena's *Praśasti* is explained by the fact that Samudra Gupta's operations were actually confined to the eastern part of Trans-Vindhyan India. There is no

[1] Fleet, CII, p 233, Ep Ind., XVII, 12. *Cf. Ind. Ant.*, June, 1926.

[2] This was Berar with the adjoining regions (*cf.* Ep. Ind., xxvi. 147). That Nāchnā and Ganj were in the Gupta Age apparently included within Dakshiṇāpatha is suggested by the *Brihat Samhitā* (xiv. 13) which places even Chitrakūṭa in the **Dakshina** or Southern Division. A recent Vākāṭaka Inscription discovered in the Drug District contains an interesting reference to Padmapura which Professor Mirashi identifies with the ancestral home of Bhavabhūti and with the modern Padampur near Amgaon in the Bhaṇḍārā District of the Central Provinces. IHQ, 1935, 299; Ep. Ind., xxii, 207 ff. The Basim grant implies control of a branch of the family over the part of Berar south of the Ajanta range.

[3] The Eraṇ and Udayagiri Inscriptions For evidence of Palaeography see JRASB, xii. 2, 1946, 73.,

[4] *Cf. Modern Review,* April, 1921, p. 475. For Dubreuil's views, see *Ind. Ant.*, June, 1926.

reliable evidence that the Gupta conqueror carried his arms to the central and western parts of the Deccan proper, *i.e.*, to the territory ruled by Pṛithivisheṇa I himself. Professor Dubreuil has shown that the identification of Devarāshṭra with Mahārāshṭra and of Eraṇḍapalla with Eraṇḍol in Khandesh is probably wrong.[1]

Though Samudra Gupta did not invade the Western Deccan it is clear from his Eraṇ Inscription that he did deprive the Vākāṭakas of their possessions in Central India. These territories were not, however, directly governed by the Vākāṭaka monarch, but were under a vassal prince. In the time of Pṛithivisheṇa this prince was Vyāghra. We should naturally expect a conflict between the Vākāṭaka feudatory and the Gupta conqueror. Curiously enough, the Allahabad *Praśasti* refers to Samudra Gupta's victory over Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra.[2] It is probable that this Vyāghrarāja is identical with the Vyāghra of the Nāchnā Inscription who was the Central Indian feudatory of Pṛithivisheṇa. As a result of Samudra Gupta's victory the Guptas succeeded the Vākāṭakas as the paramount power in parts of Central India. Henceforth the Vākāṭakas appear in fact as a purely southern power.

The victorious career of Samudra Gupta must have produced a deep impression on the **Pratyanta**[3] *nṛipatis* or frontier kings of North-East India and the Himālayan region, and the tribal states of the Pañjāb, Western India, Mālwa and the Central Provinces, who are said to have gratified his imperious command (*prachaṇḍa śāsana*) "by giving all kinds of taxes, obeying his orders and coming to perform obeisance." The most important among the eastern kingdoms which submitted to the mighty Gupta Emperor were **Samataṭa** (part of Eastern **Bengal bordering**

[1] *Cf. Modern Review*, 1921, p. 457.

[2] Has the title *Vyāghra-parākrama*, found on a type of Samudra Gupta's coins that represents the king as trampling on a tiger, anything to do with the emperor's victory over *Vyāghra-rāja*? It is not a little curious that the next sovereign, conqueror of Rudrasiṁha III, the last Satrap, assumed the title of *Siṁha-vikrama*.

[3] For the significance of the term, see *Divyāvadāna*, p. 22.

on the sea, having its capital probably at Karmmānta or Baḍ-Kamta near Comilla),[1] **Ḍavāka** (not yet satisfactorily identified)[2] and **Kāmarūpa** (in Lower Assam). We learn from the Dāmodarpur plates that the major portion of Northern Bengal, then known as Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti, formed an integral part of the Gupta Empire from A.D. 443 to A.D. 543, and was governed by a line of *Uparikas* as vassals of the Gupta Emperor. The identification of Ḍavāka with certain districts of North Bengal is, therefore, probably wrong. The Northern *Pratyantas* were Nepāl and Kartṛipura. The latter principality comprised probably Katārpur in the Jālandhar district, and the territory of the Katuria or Katyur *rāj* of Kumaun, Garhwāl and Rohilkhand.[3]

The **tribal states** which paid homage were situated on the western and south-western fringe of Āryāvarta proper. Among these the most important were the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhīras, Prārjunas, Sanakānīkas, Kākas and Kharaparikas.

The Mālavas occupied part of the Pañjāb in the time of Alexander. They were probably in Eastern Rājaputāna[4] when they came into conflict with Ushavadāta. Their exact location in the time of Samudra Gupta cannot be determined. In the time of Samudra Gupta's successors they were probably connected with the Mandasor region. We find princes of Mandasor using the reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, handed down traditionally by the Mālava-*gaṇa* (*Mālava-gaṇāmnāta*).

[1] Bhattasali, *Iconography*, pp. 4f. JASB, 1914, 85 ff. *Cf.* the position of Mahārāja Rudradatta under the emperor Vainya Gupta early in the sixth century A D (Gunaighar Ins.).

[2] *Cf.* Dekaka (Dacca), Hoyland, *The Empire of the Great Mogol*, 14. Mr K. L. Barua identifies Davāka with the Kopili Valley in Middle Assam (*Early History of Kāmarūpa*, 42 n). For the alleged use of Gupta era in the Dabokā region, see Ep., xxvii, 18f.

[3] EHI[4], 302n; JRAS, 1898, 198. *Ep. Ind.*, XIII, 114; *cf.* J. U. P. Hist. Soc., July-Dec., 1945, pp. 217 ff, where Mr. Powell-Price suggests 'some sort of connection between the Kuṇindas and the Katyurs.'

[4] *Cf* Smith, *Catalogue*, 161. Allan, *CCAI*, p. cv. Mālava coins have been found in vast numbers in the Jaipur State (JRAS, 1897, 883).

The Ārjunāyanas and the Yaudheyas are placed in the northern division of India by the author of the *Bṛihat-Saṁhitā*. They may have been connected with the Pandoouoi or Pāṇḍava tribe mentioned by Ptolemy as settled in the Pañjāb.[1] The connection of the Ārjunāyanas with the Pāṇḍava Arjuna is apparent.[2] Yaudheya appears as the name of a son of Yudhishṭhira in the *Mahābhārata*.[3] The *Harivaṁśa*, a later authority, connects the Yaudheyas with Uśīnara.[4] A clue to the locality of this tribe is given by the Bijayagaḍh Inscription.[5] The hill-fort of Bijayagaḍh lies about two miles to the south-west of Byānā in the Bharatpur state of Rājaputāna. But the Yaudheya territory must have extended beyond the limits of this area and embraced the tract still known as Johiyabār along both banks of the Sutlej on the border of the Bahāwalpur state.[6]

The Madrakas had their capital at Śākala or Śiālkoṭ in the Pañjāb. The Ābhīras occupied the tract in the lower Indus valley and western Rājaputāna, near Vinaśana[7] in the district called Abiria by the *Periplus*[8] and the geography of Ptolemy. We have already seen that an Abhīra possibly became *Mahākshatrapa* of Western India and probably supplanted the Śātavāhanas in a part of Mahārāshṭra before the middle of the third century A.D. A section of the tribe apparently settled in Central India and gave its name to the Āhirwār country between Jhansi and Bhilsa.[9] The territories of the Prārjunas, Sanakānīkas, Kākas and Kharaparikas lay probably in Mālwa and the

[1] *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, 331, 349.

[2] Their coins are found in the Mathurā region (Smith, *Catalogue*, 160). The *Abhidhāna-chintāmaṇi*, p. 434, identifies a river called Ārjunī with the Bāhudā (Rāmgaṅgā?).

[3] Ādi., 95, 76. Yaudheyas are already known to Pāṇini, V. 3, 117.

[4] Pargiter, *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, p. 380.

[5] Fleet, CII, p. 251. Yaudheya votive tablets have been found in the Ludhiana District (JRAS, 1897, 887). Coins have been found in the area extending from Saharanpur to Multan (Allan, *CCAI*, cli).

[6] Smith, JRAS, 1897, p. 30. *Cf.* Cunningham, AGI, 1924, 281.

[7] *Śūdrābhirān prati dveshād yatra nashṭā Sarasvatī*, Mbh., IX, 37. 1.

[8] *Cf. Ind. Ant.*, III, 226 f.

[9] JRAS, 1897, 891. *Cf. Ain-i-Akbari* II, 165; Malcolm, *CI*, I. 20.

Central Provinces. The Prārjunakas are mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya[1] and are located by Smith[2] in the Narsinhapur District of the Central Provinces. A clue to the locality of the Sanakānīkas is given by one of the Udayagiri Inscriptions of Chandra Gupta II discovered in Eastern Mālwa. The Kākas find mention in the *Mahābhārata*[3]—*Ṛishikā Vidabhāḥ Kākās Taṅganāḥ-Parataṅganāḥ*. In the *Bombay Gazetteer* Kāka is identified with Kākūpur near Bithur. Smith suggests that the name may be locally associated with Kākanāda (Sāñchī). The Kharaparikas may have occupied the Damoh District of the Central Provinces.[4]

The rise of a new indigenous imperial power could not be a matter of indifference to the **foreign potentates** of the North-West Frontier, Mālwa and Surāshṭra (Kāṭhīāwār) who hastened to buy peace "by the acts of homage, such as offer of personal service, the bringing of gifts of maidens,[5] begging for seals marked with the Garuḍa sign (*Garutmadaṅka*) to allow them to rule over their respective districts and provinces (*svavishaya bhukti*)."[6] The foreign powers that thus established diplomatic relations with Samudra Gupta were the *Daivaputra*[7]*-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi* and the Śaka *Muruṇḍas*[8] as well as the people of Siṁhala and all other dwellers in islands.[9]

[1] P. 194.

[2] JRAS, 1897, p. 892.

[3] Mbh. VI, 9. 64.

[4] Bhandarkar, IHQ, 1925, 258; Ep. Ind., XII, 46. H. C. Ray, *DHNI*, I, 586, mentions a Kharpara *padraka* apparently in Mālwa. A *Beṇṇākārpara-bhāga* is mentioned in the Siwani plate.

[5] The presence of Scythian maidens in the Hindu imperial harem is not surprising in view of the known facts about Chandra Gupta Maurya's alliance with Seleukos and the marriage of a Sātakarṇi with the daughter of a great satrap. *Cf.* also Penzer, II. 47; III. 170.

[6] *Cf.* Nilakanta Sastri, *The Paṇḍyan Kingdom*, 145. "The victor restored the crown and country of the Chola in the form of a religious gift, which was confirmed by the issue of a royal rescript with the Paṇḍyan seal on it."

[7] As to the form *Daiva*, see Achaemenian inscriptions of Xerxes, and forms like Bhaimarathī (instead of Bhimarathi).

[8] Note the imitation by Samudra Gupta of coins of Kushān type with *Ardochsho reverse* (Allan, xxviii, xxxiv, lxvi). Such coins were, according to scholars, issued by Scythians of the North-West.

[9] Some control over the islands in the neighbouring seas is possibly hinted

The *Daivaputra-Shāhi-Shāhānushāhi* belonged apparently to the Kushān dynasty of the north-west, which derived its origin from the *Devaputra* Kanishka.[1] The Śaka *Muruṇḍas* must have included the northern chiefs of Scythian nationality who issued the *Ardochsho* coins as well as the Śaka chieftains of Surāshṭra and Central India, the representatives of a power which once dominated even the Ganges valley. Sten Konow tells us that *Muruṇḍa* is a Śaka word meaning lord, Sanskrit *Svāmin*. The epithet *Svāmin* was used by the *Kshatrapas* of Surāshṭra and Ujjain. A Sāñchī Inscription discovered by Marshall discloses the existence of another Śaka principality or province which was ruled about A.D. 319 by the *Mahā-daṇḍanāyaka* Srīdharavarman, son of Nanda.[2] A Muruṇḍa *Svāminī* (noble lady) is mentioned in a Khoh Inscription of Central India. To Scythian chiefs of the Vindhyan region should perhaps be attributed the so-called "Puri Kushān" coins which are found in large numbers in the neighbourhood of the Eastern Vindhyas and some adjoining tracts. The existence of a Muruṇḍa power in the Ganges valley a couple of centuries before Samudra Gupta is vouched for by Ptolemy.[3] The Jaina *Prabhāvaka-charita* testifies to the control that a Muruṇḍa family once exercised over the imperial city of Pāṭaliputra.[4]

at in the epithet *Dhanada-Varuṇendrāntakasama*, the equal of Dhanada (Kuvera, lord of wealth, guardian of the north), Varuna (the Indian Sea-god the guardian of the west), Indra, king of the celestials and guardian of the east, and Antaka (Yama, god of death, and guardian of the south). The comparison of Samudra Gupta with these deities is apposite and possibly refers not only to his conquests in all directions, but to his possession of immense riches, suzerainty over the seas, the spread of his fame to the celestial region and his extirpation of various kings. Inscriptions discovered in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago testify to the activities of Indian navigators (*e.g.*, the *Mahānāvika* from Raktamṛittikā mentioned in a Malayan epigraph) and military adventures in the Gupta Age.

[1] Smith (JRAS, 1897, 32) identified him with Grumbates. Some scholars take the expression to refer to different kings and chieftains. *Cf.* Allan, xxvii. There may also be a reference to the Sassanids as well.

[2] Ep. Ind., xvi, p. 232; JRAS, 1923, 337 ff.

[3] Ind. Ant., 1884, 377; Allan, xxix; *cf. India Antiqua* (Vogel Volume, 1947), 171 f, Muruṇḍas in the Ganges Valley *c.* 245 A.D. mentioned by the Chinese.

[4] C. J. Shah. *Jainism in N. India*, p. 194; *Cf. Indian Culture*, III, 49.

Samudra Gupta's Ceylonese contemporary was Meghavarṇa. A Chinese writer, Wang Hiuen ts'e, relates that Chi-mi-kia-po-mo (*i.e.*, Śrī Meghavarman or Meghavarṇa) sent an embassy with gifts to Samudra Gupta and obtained his permission to erect a splendid monastery to the north of the holy tree at Bodh Gayā for the use of pilgrims from the Island.[1]

Allan thinks that it was at the conclusion of his campaigns that the Gupta conqueror celebrated the horse-sacrifice[2] which, we are told in the inscriptions of his successors, had long been in abeyance. But it should be noted that the *Aśvamedha* was celebrated by several kings during the interval which elapsed from the time of Pushyamitra to that of Samudra Gupta, *e.g.*, Pārāśarīputra Sarvatāta, Śātakarṇi, the husband of Nāyanikā, Vāsishṭhīputra Ikshvāku Śrī-Chāṁtamūla, Devavarman Śālaṅkāyana, Pravarasena I Vākāṭaka, Śiva-skandavarman Pallava and the Nāga kings of the house of Bhāraśiva. It is probable, however, that the court poets of the Guptas knew little about these monarchs. After the horse-sacrifice Samudra Gupta apparently issued coins bearing the legend *Aśva-medha-parākramaḥ*, 'whose prowess was demonstrated by the performance of the horse-sacrifice.'[3]

If Harisheṇa, the writer of the Allahabad *Praśasti*, is to be believed, the great Gupta was a man of versatile genius. "He put to shame the preceptor of the lord of

[1] Geiger, the *Mahāvaṁsa* (trans.), p. xxxix; Lévi, Journ. As., 1900. pp 316 ff., 401 ff; *Ind. Ant*, 1902, 194.

[2] *Cf.* Divekar, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, VII, pp. 164-65. "Allahabad *Praśasti* and *Aśvamedha*." In the Poona plates Samudra Gupta receives the epithet *anekāśvamedhayājin*. He was believed to have celebrated more than one horse-sacrifice. Some of the campaigns described in the Allahabad panegyric may have been actually conducted by Princes or officers who kept guard over the sacrificial horse that was allowed to roam at large. In the inscription of Harisheṇa the credit for capturing some of the vanquished chieftains is given to the army. Among the great commanders were men like Tilabhaṭṭaka and Harisheṇa himself, who was the son of Dhruvabhūti.

[3] Rapson and Allan refer to a seal bearing a horse and the legend *Parākrama*, and the stone figure of a horse, now in Lucknow, which are probably reminiscent of the *Aśvamedha* of Samudra Gupta. (JRAS, 1901, 102; *Gupta Coins*, xxxi.)

Gods and Tumburu[1] and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments. He established his title of *Kavirāja* by various poetical compositions."[2] "He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned ... His is the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets." Unfortunately none of these compositions have survived.[3] But the testimony of Harisheṇa to his musical abilities finds corroboration in the lyrist type[4] of his coins. Himself a poet like Harsha, Mahendravarman and other kings of a later age, the Gupta monarch associated with men of letters who were none too prosperous and "put an end to the war between good poetry and plenty" (*satkāvyaśrīvirodha*). As a result "he enjoyed in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endured in many poems."

Samudra Gupta favoured poetry as well as the *Śāstra*, while Aśoka seems to have specialised in scriptural studies alone. The former undertook military campaigns with the object of *sarva-pṛithivī-jaya*, conquest of the whole earth, as known to his panegyrist, the latter eschewed military conquest after the Kaliṅga war and organised missions to effect *Dhamma-vijaya*, conquest of the hearts of men, in three continents. Yet in spite of these differences there was much that was common to these remarkable men. Both laid stress on *parākrama*, ceaseless exertion in the cause in which they believed. Both expressed solici-

[1] For Tumburu see *Adbhuta-Rāmāyaṇa*, VI. 7; *EI*, I. 236.

[2] According to the *Kāvya Mīmāṁsā* (3rd ed., GOS, pp. xv, xxxii, 19) a "*Kavirāja* is one stage further than a *Mahākavi*, and is defined as one who is unrestrained in various languages, various sorts of poetical compositions and various sentiments." For the intellectual activities of the Gupta Age see Bhandarkar, "*A Peep into the Early History of India*," pp. 61-74 and Bühler, *IA*, 1913. The son and successor of Samudra Gupta had the title *Rūpakṛitī*, 'maker of plays'.

[3] A poetical work called the *Kṛishṇa-charitam* is attributed to Vikramāṅka Mahārājādhirāja Paramabhāgavata Śrī Samudra Gupta (IC, X, 79, etc.). But the ascription has been doubted by competent critics (*cf.* Jagannāth in *Annals, BORI*, and others).

[4] A lute-player (*Vīṇā-gāthin*) plays an important part in the *Aśvamedha*.

tude for the people committed to their care, and were kind even to vanquished enemies. And both laid emphasis on *Dharma*. Samudra Gupta, no less than Dharmāśoka, made firm the rampart of the true law (*Dharma-prāchira-bandhaḥ*).

The attribution of the coins bearing the name Kācha to Samudra Gupta may be accepted. But the emperor's identification with *Dharmāditya* (sun of the true faith) of a Faridpur grant is clearly wrong. The titles used by this monarch were *Apratiratha*, 'unrivalled car-warrior,' *Aprativāryavīrya*, 'of irresistible valour,' *Kritānta-paraśu*, 'axe of death,' *sarva-rāj-ochchhettā*,[1] 'uprooter of all kings,' *Vyāghra-parākrama*, 'possessed of the strength of a tiger,' *Aśva-medha-parākrama*, 'whose might was demonstrated by the horse-sacrifice,' and *Parākramāṅka*, 'marked with prowess,' but not *Dharmāditya*. Most of these epithets are connected with particular types of coins issued by the emperor. Thus *Parākrama* is found on the reverse of coins of the standard type, *Apratiratha* on coins of the archer type, *Kṛitānta-paraśu* on coins of the battle-axe type,[2] *sarvarājochchhetta* on coins of the Kāch type, *Vyāghraparākrama* (*Rājā*) on the tiger type of coins, and *Aśvamedha-parākrama* on the *Aśvamedha* type.[3] The appearance of a goddess seated on a lion (*siṁha-vāhinī*, *i.e.*, Durgā or Pārvatī, *Vindhya-vāsinī* or *Haimavatī*) may point to the extension of the Gupta dominions to the Vindhya and the Himavat.[4] The tiger and river-goddess (*makaravāhinī*) type may indicate that the sway of Samudra Gupta spread from the Ganges valley to the realm of the 'Tiger king' in Mahākāntāra. The figures of Gaṅgā and Yamunā occur frequently in door jambs of the Gupta Age.

[1] *Cf.* the epithet "*sarva-kshattrāntaka*" applied to his great fore-runner, Mahāpadma Nanda.

[2] The battle-axe appears also on coins of the Udumbaras, *CHI*, 539; and Jayadāman, Rapson (Andhra, etc.), 76.

[3] *Cf.* 'Horse facing post' which appears also on a square coin attributed to Chashṭana (Rapson *ibid.*, 75) whose dynasty was overthrown by the Guptas.

[4] Nana on lion of Huvishka's coins (Whitehead, 207) may have suggested this type.

It has been surmised that they symbolise connection with the Gangetic Doāb.

Samudra Gupta's 'virtuous and faithful wife,' possibly Datta Devī, appears to be mentioned in an Eraṇ inscription referable to the period of his rule. We possess no genuine dated documents for the reign of the great emperor. The Nālandā[1] and Gayā grants profess to be dated in the years 5 and 9 respectively, but no reliance can be placed on them and the reading of the numeral in the Gayā record is uncertain. Smith's date (A.D. 330-375) for Samudra Gupta is conjectural. As the earliest known date of the next sovereign is A.D. 380-381[2] it is not improbable that his father and predecessor died some time after A.D. 375.[3] One of the last acts of Samudra Gupta was apparently the selection of his successor. The choice fell on Chandra Gupta, his son by Datta Devī.

[1] ASI, AR, 1927-28, p. 138.

[2] An inscription of Chandra Gupta II, dated in the year 61, corresponding to A.D. 380-81 was discovered in the Mathurā District (*Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 1 ff.).

[3] Sircar (IHQ, 1942, 272) reads the dated portion of the inscription of the year 61 as *Śrī Chandra Guptasya vijaya-rājya samvatsare pañchame*—the fifth regnal year of Chandra Gupta (II). Therefore, his first year may be taken to be A.D. 376-77.

CHAPTER XI. THE GUPTA EMPIRE—(*continued*): THE AGE OF THE VIKRAMĀDITYAS.

Kāmaṁ nṛipāḥ santu sahasraśo' nye
rājanvatīmāhuranena bhūmim
nakshatra-tārā-graha saṅkulāpi
jyotishmatī Chandramasaiva rātriḥ.
—*Raghuvaṁśam.*

SECTION I. CHANDRA GUPTA II VIKRAMADITYA.

Epigraphic evidence indicates that Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, also called Narendra Chandra, Siṁha Chandra, Narendra Siṁha and Siṁha Vikrama,[1] born of queen Dattadevī. Chandra Gupta was chosen out of many sons by his father as the best fitted to succeed him.[2] Another name

[1] Cf. the name Vikrama Siṁha of Ujjayinī. Penzer, III. 11. The story narrated in *Vishamaśila Lambaka*, has for its hero Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya, who is apparently to be identified with Skanda Gupta. But some of the *motifs* such as *strīvesha* (*Kathā Sar.* XVIII. 3. 42), visit to the enemy's own place with a Vetāla (5. 40 f) were probably taken from the cycle of legends associated with Chandra Gupta II, father of Mahendra.

[2] That Samudra Gupta had many sons and grandsons appears clear from the Eraṇ epigraph. The theory of Dr. Altekar (JBORS, XIV, pp. 223-53, XV, pt. i-ii, pp. 134 f.) and others that a king named Rāma (Śarma? Sena?) Gupta intervened between Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II is unsupported by any contemporary *epigraphic* evidence. The tradition that a Gupta king killed his brother and took his wife and crown, dates only from a ninth century epigraph. The *literary* evidence on the point is discrepant and hardly conclusive. The version given by Bāṇa in the seventh century differs in important respects from the story known to the author of the *Kāvya-Mimāṁsā*, Cir. 900 A.D. (*Cf. Ind. Ant.*, Nov., 1933, 201 ff.; JBORS, XVIII, 1, 1932, 17 ff.). The simple story, narrated in the *Harsha-Charita*, that Chandra Gupta, disguised as a female, destroyed a Śaka (not Khaśa) king, who coveted the wife of another, in the very city of the enemy, was doubtless embellished by later poets and dramatists, and (as is clear from certain data, to which Mr. V. V. Mirashi draws attention in IHQ, March, 1934, 48 ff.) details, such as fratricide, and association with ghouls, not found in the earlier account, continued to be added in the days of Amoghavarsha I (A. D. 815-78) and Govinda IV (A.D. c. 927-933). The *Devī Chandraguptam* and similar works are as much unsuited to form bases of the chronicles of Chandra Gupta II as

of the new monarch disclosed by certain Vākāṭaka inscriptions, several types of coins and the Sāñchī inscription of A. D. 412-3 was Deva Gupta, Deva-śrī or Deva-rāja.[1]

For the reign of Chandra Gupta II, we possess a number of dated inscriptions so that its limits may be defined with more accuracy than those of his predecessors. His accession should be placed before A.D. 381, and his death in or about A.D. 413-14.

The most important external events of the reign were the emperor's matrimonial alliance with the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II, son of Pṛithivisheṇa I, and the war with the Śaka Satraps which added Western Mālwa and Surāshṭra (Kāṭhiāwār) to the Gupta dominions.

Matrimonial alliances occupy a prominent place in the foreign policy of the Guptas. The Lichchhavi connection had strengthened their position in Bihār. After the conquest of the upper provinces they sought alliances with other ruling families whose help was needed to consolidate the Gupta power in the newly acquired territory and prepare the ground for fresh conquests. Thus Samudra Gupta received presents of girls (*kanyopāyana*) from Śaka-Kushān chiefs and other foreign potentates. Chandra Gupta II married Kuberanāgā, a princess of Nāga lineage,[2] and had by her a daughter named Prabhāvatī, whom he gave in marriage to Rudrasena II, the Vākāṭaka king of Berar and the

the *Mudrārākshasam* and the *Aśokāvadāna* are in regard to the doings of the great Mauryas. The subject has been fully discussed by the present writer in an article entitled "*Vikramāditya in History and legend*" contributed to the Vikrama-volume, Scindhia Oriental Institute (1948), pp. 483-511. The story of Chandra Gupta's adventure in its developed form has absorbed a good deal of folklore, such as tales about ghouls, *Piśācha* The *motif* of the wife leaving a mean-spirited husband is found in Penzer, *Kathā* S. S., III, 290.

[1] *Cf*. Bhandarkar, *Ind. Ant*. 1913, p. 160.

[2] *Nāga-kulotpannā cf*. JASB, 1924, p. 58. It is possible as urged by many writers, that Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya also entered into marriage alliances with the Kadambas of Vaijayantī or Banavāsi in Kuntala, or the Kanarese, country. The sending of an embassy to Kuntala by Vikramāditya, is vouched for by Bhoja and Kshemendra. (*Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference*, p. 6.) Kākusthavarman of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings in or about the fifth century (Talagunda Inscription, Ep. Ind., VIII, 33 ff.: IHQ, 1933, 197 ff.).

adjoining districts. According to Dr. Smith[1] "the Vākāṭaka *Mahārāja* occupied a geographical position in which he could be of much service or disservice to the northern invader of the dominions of the Śaka satraps of Gujrāt and Surāshṭra. Chandra Gupta adopted a prudent precaution in giving his daughter to the Vākāṭaka prince and so securing his subordinate alliance."

The campaign against the Western Satraps is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave Inscription of Vīrasena-Śāba in the following passage "he (Śāba) came here (to Eastern Mālwa), accompanied by the king (Chandra Gupta) in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world." Śāba was an inhabitant of Pāṭaliputra. He held the position, acquired by hereditary descent, of a *Sachiva* or minister of Chandra Gupta II, and was placed by his sovereign in charge of the Department of Peace and War. He naturally accompanied his master when the great western expedition was undertaken. Eastern Mālwa, which had already felt the might of Samudra Gupta, became the base of operations against the Śakas. Inscriptions at Udayagiri and Sāñchī suggest that the emperor Chandra Gupta II assembled at or near Vidiśā in East Mālwa many of his ministers, generals and feudatories, some of whom are mentioned in records dating from A.D. 402 to 413. The campaign against the Śakas was eminently successful. The fall of the Śaka Satrap is alluded to by Bāṇa. The annexation of his territory is proved by coins.[2]

Chief Cities of the Empire.—The first important Gupta metropolis seems to have been at Pāṭaliputra—"the city named Pushpa" where Samudra Gupta is said to have

[1] JRAS, 1914, p. 324.

[2] Silver coins of the Garuḍa type bearing the legend *Parama-Bhāgavata*, probably struck in Surāshṭra (Allan, p. xciv). Some of the coins bear the date 90 (=A.D. 409, EHI, 4th ed., p. 345). It has been suggested that, like his father, Chandra Gupta, too, performed a horse sacrifice (IHQ, 1927, p. 725) and that a stone horse lying in a village named Nagawa near Benares, and bearing an inscription containing the letters Chamdragu, commemorates the event. But there is no clear reference to such a sacrifice in the inscriptions or coins hitherto published.

"rested on his laurels" after one of his victorious campaigns, and from which a Gupta Minister for Peace and War went to East Mālwa in the company of his sovereign. From A.D. 402 Chandra Gupta seems to have had a residence in Mālwa, at first possibly at Vidiśā and later on, after his western conquests, at Ujjain. Certain chiefs of the Kanarese districts, who claimed descent from Chandra Gupta (Vikramāditya), referred to their great ancestor as *Ujjayinī-puravar-ādhīśvara*, 'lord of Ujjain, the best of cities,' as well as *Pāṭaliputravar-ādhīśvara*, 'lord of Pāṭali (putra), the best of cities.' Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies Chandra Gupta II with the traditional Vikramāditya *Śakāri*, "the sun of valour, the destroyer of the Śakas," of Ujjain.[1] The titles *Śrī Vikramaḥ*, *Siṁha-Vikramaḥ*, *Ajita-Vikramaḥ*, *Vikramāṅka* and *Vikramāditya* actually occur on Chandra Gupta's coins.[2]

[1] In literature Vikramāditya is represented as ruling at Pāṭaliputra (*Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, VII. 4. 3'—*Vikramāditya itvāsidrājā Pāṭaliputrake*) as well as Ujjayinī and other cities. Sāhasāṅka of Ujjain is said to have ordered the exclusive use of Sanskrit in his harem (*Kāvya Mīmāmsā*, 3rd ed., p. 50). He thus reversed the policy of Āḍhyarāja (p. 197) or Śātavāhana of Kuntala. *Cf.* the verse in *Sarasvatī Kaṇṭhābharaṇa* II. 15.

Ke'bhunn Āḍhyarājasya rājye prākrita-bhāshiṇaḥ
kāle śrī Sāhasāṅkasya ke na Saṁskṛitavādinaḥ.

Among the *Kāvya-kāras* tested in Ujjain mention is made of a Chandra Gupta along with Kālidāsa, Amara, Bhāravi and others (*Kāvya M.*, p. 55). Paramārtha, the biographer of Vasubandhu, refers to Ayodhyā as the capital of a Vikramāditya while Hiuen Tsang represents Śrāvastī as the seat of the famous king (EHI, 3rd Ed., pp. 332-33). Subandhu refers to the fame of Vikramāditya, but not to his capital city, "like a lake Vikramāditya hath left the earth, save indeed in fame" (Keith, *Hist. Sans. Lit.*, p. 312). *Cf.* Hāla, v. 64.

[2]

Name, title or epithet.	Type of coin.
Śrī Vikrama	Archer type (gold). Couch type (gold).
Vikramāditya	Chhattra (Parasol) type (gold).
Rūpakṛitī	Couch type (gold).
Siṁha-Vikrama, Narendra Chandra, Narendra Siṁha, Siṁha Chandra	Lion-Slayer (gold).
Ajita-Vikrama Paramabhāgavata	Horseman type (gold).
Paramabhāgavata Vikramāditya Vikramāṅka	Silver coins of the Garuḍa type.
Vikramāditya, Mahārāja, Chandra	Copper coins (Garuḍa, Chhattra and Vase type).

We have no detailed contemporary notice of Ujjayinī (also called Viśālā, Padmāvatī, Bhogavatī, Hiraṇyavatī)[1] in the days of Chandra Gupta. But Fa-hien who visited Mid India during the period A.D. 405 to 411, has left an interesting account of Pāṭaliputra. The pilgrim refers to the royal palace of Aśoka and the halls in the midst of the city, "which exist now as of old," and were according to him "all made by spirits which Aśoka employed, and which piled up the stones, reared the walls and gates, and executed the elegant carving and inlaid sculpture-work,—in a way which no human hands of this world could accomplish." "The inhabitants are rich and prosperous, and vie with one another in the practice of benevolence and righteousness. Every year on the eighth day of the second month they celebrate a procession of images... The Heads of the *Vaiśya* families establish houses for dispensing charity and medicines." The principal port of the empire on the east coast was Tāmralipti or Tamluk in West Bengal from which ships set sail for Ceylon, Java (then a centre of Brāhmaṇism), and China.

Much light is thrown on the character of Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya's **administration** by the narrative of Fa-hien and the inscriptions that have hitherto been discovered. Speaking of the Middle Kingdom, the dominions of Chandra Gupta in the upper Ganges Valley, the Chinese pilgrim says: "the people are numerous and happy; they have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules; only those who cultivate the royal land have to pay a portion of the gain from it. If they want to go, they go: if they want to stay on, they stay. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. Criminals are simply fined, lightly or heavily, according to the circumstances of each case. Even in cases of repeated attempts

[1] *Meghadūta* (I. 31) and *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, Tawney's translation, Vol. II, p. 275. For an account of Ujjayinī in the seventh century A.D., see Beal, H. Tsang. II, p. 270; and Ridding, *Kādambarī*, pp. 210 ff.

at wicked rebellion they only have their right hands cut off. The king's bodyguards and attendants all have salaries. Throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the *Chāṇḍālas*. In buying and selling commodities they use *cowries*."[1] The last statement evidently refers to such small transactions as Fa-hien had occasion to make.[2] The pilgrim does not seem to have met with the gold coins which would only be required for large transactions. That they were actually in currency, we know from the references to "*dīnāras*" and "*suvarṇas*" in inscriptions.[3]

That Chandra Gupta II was a good monarch may be inferred also from the inscriptions. Himself a devout *Vaishṇava* (*Parama-bhāgavata*), he appointed men of other sects to high offices. His general Āmrakārddava, the hero of a hundred fights, *anēkasamar-āvāpta-vijaya-yaśas-patākaḥ*, appears to have been a Buddhist or at least a pro-Buddhist, while his Minister of Peace and War, Śāba-Vīrasena, and perhaps also his *Mantrin* or High Counsellor, Śikharasvāmin, were *Śaivas*.

Regarding the machinery of Government we have no detailed information. But the following facts may be gleaned from the inscriptions. As in Maurya times, the head of the state was the *Rājā* who was at times nominated by his predecessor. The king is now regarded as a divinity—*Achintya Purusha*, 'the Incomprehensible Being,' *Dhanada-Varuṇendrāntaka-sama*, the equal of Kuvera, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama, *loka dhāma deva*, 'a god dwelling on earth,' *Paramadaivata*, 'the supreme

[1] Legge.

[2] Allan.

[3] Chandra Gupta II also issued silver and copper coins. The silver coins were mainly intended for the western provinces conquered from the Śaka satraps but they are also mentioned in the time of his son in inscriptions of Northern Bengal. The Baigram inscription of the year 128 (448 A.D.) for instance refers to *rūpakas* along with *dīnāras* (*cf.* Allan, p. cxxvii). The copper coins issued by Chandra Gupta II are commonly found around Ayodhyā (Allan, p. cxxxi).

deity.' He was assisted by a body of High Ministers whose office was very often hereditary as is suggested by the phrase "*anvaya-prāpta sāchivya*" 'acquirer of the post of minister by hereditary descent', of the Udayagiri Inscription of Śāba.[1] The most important among the High Ministers were the *Mantrin*, 'High Counsellor,' the *Sāṁdhi-vigrahika*, 'Minister for Peace and War,' and the *Akshapaṭal-ādhikṛita*, 'the Lord Keeper of State Documents.' Like the Kauṭilyan *Mantrin*, the Gupta *Sāṁdhi-vigrahika* accompanied the sovereign to the battle-field. As in the case of most of the *Pradhānas* of Śivājī there was no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. The same person could be *Sāṁdhi-vigrahika*, *Kumārāmātya* (cadet-minister), and *Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka*, 'great commandant of the army,' and a *Mantrin* could become a *Mahā-bal-ādhikṛita*, 'chief commander of forces.'

It is not clear whether the Guptas had a central council of ministers (*Mantri-parishad*).[2] But the existence of local *parishads* (*e.g.*, the *Parishad* of Udānakūpa) is proved by a Basārh seal discovered by Bloch.

The empire was divided into a number of provinces styled *Deśas*, *Bhuktis*, etc., sub-divided into districts called *Pradeśas* or *Vishayas*.[3] Among *Deśas* the Gupta inscriptions mention Śukuli-*deśa*, Surāshṭra (Kāṭhiāwāḍ), Ḍabhālā (the Jubbalpore region, Ḍāhala or Chedi of later times) and "*Kālindī Narmadayor Madhya*," the territory lying between the Jumna and the Nerbudda, and embracing, no doubt, Eastern Mālwa, are also perhaps to be placed under this category.

[1] The *Mahā-daṇḍa-nāyaka Harishena* was the son of the *Mahādaṇḍa-nāyaka* Dhruva-bhūti. The *Mantrin* Pṛithivisheṇa was the son of the *Mantrin* Śikharasvāmin. *Cf.* also the hereditary governors (*goptṛi*), of Mandasor, Surāshṭra, etc. Things were somewhat different in the Maurya Period Pushya Gupta, *Rāshṭriya* of Surāshṭra in the time of Chandra Gupta Maurya, was quite unconnected by blood with Tushāspha, governor or feudatory in the time of Aśoka.

[2] The Bilsaḍ Ins. (CII, 44) refers to a [*Pa*]*rshad*. But there is nothing to show that it was a central political assembly. The *Sabhyas* mentioned in connection with the nomination scene in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription may, however, have been members of a Central *Curia Regis* or Council.

[3] A territorial unit styled *Vīthī* is also known.

Among *Bhuktis* (*lit.* allotments) we have reference in inscriptions of the Gupta and early Post-Gupta Age to Puṇḍra-vardhana *bhukti* (North Bengal), Vardhamāna *bhukti* (West Bengal), Tīra *bhukti* (North Bihār), Nagara *bhukti* (South Bihār), Śrāvastī *bhukti* (Oudh), and Ahichchhatra *bhukti* (Rohilkhand), all situated in the Ganges valley. Among *Pradeśas* or *Vishayas* mention is made of Lāṭa-*vishaya* (in continental Gujarāṭ), Tripurī-*vishaya* (in the Jubbalpure region), Airikiṇa in Eastern Mālwa (called *Pradeśa* in Samudra Gupta's Eraṇ inscription, and *Vishaya* in that of Toramāṇa), Antarvedī (the Gangetic Doāb), Vālavī (?) Gayā, Koṭivarsha (the Dinājpur region in North Bengal), Mahākhushāpāra (?), Khāḍāṭāpāra (?) and Kuṇḍadhāṇi.[1]

The *Deśas* were governed by officers called *Goptṛis*, or Wardens of the Marches, as is suggested by the passage *Sarveshu Deśeshu vidhāya Goptṛin* 'having appointed Goptṛis in all the *Deśas*.' The *Bhuktis* were usually governed by *Uparikas or Uparika Mahārājas* who were sometimes apparently princes of the Imperial family, *e.g.*, *Rājaputra-deva-bhaṭṭāraka,* Governor of Puṇḍravardhana *bhukti* mentioned in a Dāmodarpur plate, Govinda Gupta, Governor of Tīra*bhukti* mentioned in the Basārh seals[2] and possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of Tumain in Central India. The office of *Vishaya-pati* or District Officer was held by Imperial officials like the *Kumār-āmātyas* and *Āyuktakas*,[3] as well as by feudatory *Mahārājas* like Mātṛivishṇu of Eraṇ. Some of the *Vishayapatis*, *e.g.*, Śarvanāga of Antarvedi[4], were possibly directly under the Emperor, while others, *e.g.*, those of Koṭivarsha, Airikiṇa and Tri-

[1] *Cf.* Kuṇḍadhāna, a town mentioned in the *Book of the Gradual Sayings*, I. 18 n.

[2] Govinda Gupta is known also from the newly discovered Mandasor Ins. of the Mālava—Vikrama year 524 (noticed by Garde, *ASI*, Annual Report, 1922-23, p. 187; *Cal. Rev.*; 1926, July, 155; *Ep. Ind.*, xix, App. No. 7; xxvii, 12 ff.) which mentions his *Senādhipa* or captain Vāyurakshita, and Vāyu's son Dattabhaṭa, Commander-in-chief of the forces of king Prabhākara (467-68 A.D.).

[3] They are also known as officers apparently in charge of *vīthis* or smaller units.

[4] And Kulavṛiddhi of Pañchanagari (in North Bengal), *Ep. Ind.*, xxi, 81.

purī, were usually under provincial Governors. The Governors and District Officers were no doubt helped by officials and dignitaries like the *Dāṇḍika, Chaur-oddharaṇika* and *Daṇḍapāśika*[1] (apparently judicial and police officials), *Nagara Śreshṭhī* (President or Alderman of a city-guild), *Sārthavāha* (*lit.* caravan-leader or merchant), *Prathama-Kulika* (foreman of artisans), *Prathama-Kāyastha* (the chief scribe), *Pusta-pāla* (record-keeper) and others. Every *Vishaya* consisted of a number of "*grāmas*" or villages which were administered by headmen and other functionaries styled *Grāmikas, Mahattaras* and *Bhojakas*.[2]

Outside the limits of the Imperial provinces lay the vassal kingdoms and republics, mentioned in the Allahabad *praśasti* and other documents.

The Basārh seals throw some interesting sidelight on the provincial and municipal government as well as the economic organisation of the province of Tīrabhukti (Tirhut) in North Bihār. The province was apparently governed by prince Govinda Gupta, a son of the Emperor by the *Mahādevī* Śrī Dhruva-svāminī, who had his capital at Vaiśālī. The seals mention several officials like the *Uparika* (governor), the *Kumār-āmātya* (cadet-minister).[3]

[1] Cf. Dandoāsi, Village Watchman, *JASB*, 1916, 90.

[2] In the *Mrichchhakaṭika* (Act IX), which may be a composition of the period between Bāṇa (who knew a king Śūdraka, but no poet of the same name) and Vāmana (8th century) the judge (*adhikaraṇika*) in a court of law is accompanied by a *Śreshṭhin* and a *Kāyastha*. Reference is also made to the *Adhikaraṇa-Bhojakas* and a *Mahattaraka* in connection with the arrangement of benches in the *Vyāvahāra-maṇḍapa* (the hall of justice) and the detection of people "wanted" by the city Police (*nagara-raksh-ādhikṛita*). The *Mudrārākshasa* of Viśākhadatta which is probably to be assigned to a period anterior to Rājaśekhara, the Daśarūpaka and Bhoja, perhaps also to Vāmana but not to Avantivarma (of the Maukhari or Utpala dynasty) or Dantivarman (Rāshtrakūṭa or Pallava) whose name or names occur in the *Bharata Vākya*, makes mention of *Kāyastha, Daṇḍapāśika*, etc. Village functionaries were ordinarily placed under officials of the *Vishaya* or district. But in exceptional cases they had direct dealings with the *Uparika* or governor of a *Bhukti* (*Ep. Ind.*, XV, 136).

[3] It has been taken to mean (1) minister of a prince as distinguished from that of the King (*rājāmātya*), (2) minister in charge of Princes, C. V. Vaidya, *Med. Hind. Ind.*, I, 138, (3) a junior minister whose father is alive, or (4) one who has been a minister since the days of his youth. But *cf. Ep. Ind.*, X, 49, XV, 302 f. It will be seen that the Kumārāmātyas were, as stated by a previous

the *Mahā-pratihāra* (the great chamberlain), *Talavara* (general or local chief),[1] the *Mahā-daṇḍanāyaka* (the great commandant), the *Vinayasthiti*[2] *sthāpaka*,[3] the censor [?], and the *Bhaṭāśvapati* (lord of the army and cavalry), and the following offices, *e.g.*, *Yuvarāja-pādīya Kumār-āmātya-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the Minister of His Highness the Crown Prince, according to Vogel), *Raṇabhāṇḍāgār-ādhikaraṇa*[4] (office of the chief treasurer of the war department), *Balādhikaraṇa* (war office), *Daṇḍapāś-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the chief of Police), *Tīra-bhukty-Upārik-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the Governor of Tirhut), *Tīrabhuktau Vinayasthiti-sthāpak-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the censor [?] of Tirhut), *Vaiśāly-ādhishṭhānādhikaraṇa* (office of the government of the city of Vaiśālī), *Śrī-parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādīya Kumār-āmātya-ādhikaraṇa* (office of the cadet-minister waiting on His Majesty).[5]

The reference to the *Parishad* (Council or Committee) of Udānakūpa shows that the *Parishad* still formed an important element of the machinery of local government. The mention of the 'mote-hall of aldermen of guilds, caravan-leaders and foremen of artisans' (*Śreshṭhī-*

writer, divided into two classes, *viz.*, (*i*) *Yuvarājapādīya*, those serving the Crown Prince, and (*ii*) *Parama-bhaṭṭārakapādīya*, those serving the Emperor himself. This perhaps makes the interpretation 'counsellor of, or in charge of the Prince' untenable. See, however, Penzer. I. 32; III. 136. The most probable view is that the term *Kumāra* in the expression *Kumārāmātya* corresponds to *Pina*, *Chikka*, *Immadi*, *Ilaya*, of the south, and is the opposite of *Peda* (*Prauḍha*), *Piriya*. In the Gupta Age the Kumārāmātyas often served as district officers. The office was also combined with that of a general, counsellor and foreign secretary.

[1] Cf. *talāra* of the Chīrwā Inscription of Samara Siṁha.

[2] Dr. Basak takes *Vinaya-sthiti* in the sense of law and order (*The History of North-Eastern India*, p. 312).

[3] In the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Sthāpaka* is the designation of the introducer of a play (Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 340). Here a different functionary may be meant.

[4] The mention of *Raṇa-bhāṇḍāgāra* suggests that the finance department had its military as distinguished from the civil side.

[5] A distinction is drawn between imperial officials and those connected with viceregal administration and amongst the latter officers of the province of Tīra-*bhukti* are clearly distinguished from the public servants in charge of the subordinate administration of the *adhishṭhāna of Vaiśāli*.

sārthavāha-kulika-nigama) is of interest to students of economics.

Chandra Gupta II had at least two queens, Dhruvadevī and Kubera-nāgā. The first queen was the mother of Govinda Gupta and Kumāra Gupta I.[1] The second queen had a daughter named Prabhāvatī who became queen of the Vākāṭakas. The latter was the mother of the Princes Divākarasena, Dāmodarasena and Pravarasena II (or III). Certain mediaeval chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta. The origin of these chiefs is probably to be traced to some unrecorded adventures of Vikramāditya in the Deccan.[2]

[1] A son of Chandra Gupta styled *bhūpati* (king) *Chandraprakāśa* is mentioned in a verse quoted by Vāmana in his *Kāvyālaṅkāra-Sūtravṛitti* (JASB, Vol. I, No. 10. [N.S.], 1905, 253 ff.). But the identity of this Chandra Gupta is uncertain. His identification with Vikramāditya (*i.e.*, Chandra Gupta II) rests on the vexed problem of the date of Vasubandhu (or Subandhu ?) alleged to be mentioned by Vāmana, and the question as to whether the personage mentioned may be identified with the Buddhist scholar whose biographer was Paramārtha (A.D. 500-69). Paramārtha was a Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāradvāja family of Ujjayinī who stayed for a time in Magadha and then went to China (A.D. 546-69). According to his account Vasubandhu was born at Purushapura or Peshāwār of the Brāhmaṇa family of Kauśika. He went to Ayodhyā at the invitation of Bālāditya, son of Vikramāditya (JRAS, 1905, 33 ff.). For some recent views about the date of Vasubandhu, see *Indian Studies in Honour of C. R. Lanman*, 79 ff.

[2] Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* and Bhoja in his *Śṛiṅgāra Prakāśikā* mention that Kālidāsa was sent on an embassy to a Kuntala king by Vikramāditya. "Kṣemendra, in the *Aucitya Vicāra Carcā*, refers to Kālidāsa's *Kunteśvara Dautya*" (*Proceedings of the Third Oriental Conference*, 1924, p. 6). That the Guptas actually established contact with Kuntala appears clear from the Tālagund Inscription which states that a Kadamba ruler of the Kanarese country gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. An important indication of Gupta influence in the South Western Deccan is possibly afforded by the coins of Kumāra Gupta I found in the Satara District (Allan, p. cxxx). The *rôle* assigned to Kālidāsa by Rājaśekhara, Bhoja and Kshemendra is not unworthy of credence as tradition points to a date for him in the early Gupta Age. For traditions about his synchronism with Mahārājādhirāja Vikramāditya (*Śakārāti*) and Dignāga and with king Pravarasena who is held to be the author of the poem *Setubandha* written in *Mahārāshṭrī Prākrita* and is, therefore, presumably identical with one of the kings bearing the same name in the Vākāṭaka family, (recorded in Abhinanda's *Rāmacharita*, ch. 32, Hāla, *Gāthāsaptaśatī*, Bhūmikā, p. 8 and other works) see *Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference*, 99 ff.; Mallinātha's comment on *Meghadūta*, I. 14; *Ind. Ant.*, 1912, 267, JRAS, 1918, 118f. It has recently been pointed out by Mr. Mirashi that the Pattan plates of Pravarasena II (year 27) refer to a Kālidāsa as the writer of the charter, *Ep. Ind.*, xxiii (1935), pp. 81 ff. But the identity of the scribe with the great poet remains doubtful.

GENEALOGY OF THE VĀKĀṬAKAS OF VISHṆUVṚIDDHA GOTRA

* It must not be understood that Sarvasena was necessarily the elder of the two brothers. The matter may be settled when further evidence is available.

[1] He performed four *Aśvamedhas*, and is styled a *Mahārāja*, and *Samrāj*. His traditional capital Kāñchanakāpura recalls Hiraṇyapura (Hirapur? SSE of Sāgar) of the Dudia plates (*Ep. Ind.* III. 258ff). The splitting up of the name into Purikā and Chanakā seems hardly justifiable.

[2] *J. Num. Soc.*, v pt. ii, p. 2. *Coins and Identity of Bhavanāga* (Altekar).

[3] A *dharma-vijayī* whose "kosa-daṇḍa-sādhana" is said to have been accumulating for a hundred years.

[4] Identified by some with Nagardhan near Ramtek (Hiralal Ins. No. 4.; Tenth Or. Conf. p. 458) and by others with Nandapur, near Ghughusgarh, north-east of Ramtek (Wellsted *Notes on the Vākāṭakas*), JASB, 1933, 160f.

[5] Ruler of pravarapura, Charmmāṅka and of following *rājyas, viz.*, Bhojakata (N. Berar), Ārammi (east of Berar) and of the Wardhā region. Pravarapura has been identified by some with Pavnār in Wardhā District (JASB, 1933, 159).

[6] His commands were honoured by rulers of Kosalā, Mekalā (at the source of the Nerbudda) and Mālava.

[7] Credited with the conquest of Kuntala, Avanti, Kalinga, Kosala, Andhra, Trikūṭa, Lāṭa.

SECTION II. KUMĀRA GUPTA I MAHENDRĀDITYA.

Chandra Gupta II's successor was Kumāra Gupta I[1] surnamed Mahendrāditya[2] whose certain dates range from A.D. 415 to A.D. 455.[3] His extensive coinage, and the wide distribution of his inscriptions show that he was able to retain his father's empire including the central and western provinces.[4] One of his **viceroys**, Chirātadatta, governed Puṇḍravardhana *Bhukti* or roughly North Bengal,[5] another viceroy, prince Ghaṭotkacha Gupta,

[1] The Mandasor inscription of the Mālava year 524 suggests that Kumāra may have had a rival in his brother prince Govinda Gupta. In the record Indra (*vivudhā dhipa*, Kumāra?, who is styled Śrī Mahendra and Mahendrakarmā on coins) represented as being suspicious of Govinda's power. *Ep. Ind.*, XIX, App. No. 7 and n. 5; Ep. xxvii. 15.

[2] Also called *Śrī Mahendra* (on coins of the Archer type), *Aśvamedha Mahendra* (on coins of the *Aśvamedha* type), *Mahendrakarmā*, *Ajita Mahendra* (on coins of the horseman type and sometimes on the lion-slayer type), *Siṁha Mahendra* (on coins of the lion-slayer type), *Śrī Mahendra Simha* (also on coins of the lion-slayer type), *Mahendra Kumāra* (on coins of the peacock type) *Mahendra-kalpa* (Tumain Ins.), *Siṁha Vikrama* (on coins of the lion-slayer type; Allan, *Gupta Coins*, p. 80), *Vyāghra bala-parākrama* (on coins of the tiger-slayer type) and *Śrī Pratāpa*. On the swordsman type of gold coins and on copper coins of the Garuḍa and possibly *siṁha-vāhinī* types the emperor is simply called Śrī Kumāra Gupta. The title Mahendrāditya with the epithet *Parama bhāgavata*, 'devoted worshipper of the Bhagavat (Vishṇu-Krishṇa),' is found on silver coins, apparently struck in Surāshṭra.

[3] The date 96 (=A.D. 415) is found in the Bilsar Inscription and the date 136 (=A.D. 455) on silver coins (*EHI*, 4th ed., pp. 345-46). The Eraṇ inscription of Samudra Gupta refers to his 'virtuous and faithful wife' and *many* sons and *son's sons* of the royal pair. From this it seems *probable* that Kumāra Gupta and his brothers were already born during the reign of their grandfather, and that Kumāra had seen not less than some thirty five summers before his accession. As he reigned for at least forty years, he could not have died before the age of 75 (approximately).

[4] The possession of the central districts in the Ganges valley is, according to Allan, confirmed by the silver coins of the peacock type (cf. the Ayodhyā coins of Āryamitra, *CHI*, I. 538 and Meghadūta I. 45.) and the inclusion of the western province by those of the Garuḍa type. Silverplaited coins with a copper core were intended for circulation in the Valabhī area, and coins of small thick fabric resembling the Traikuṭaka coinage were apparently struck in South Gujarāṭ (Allan, pp. xciii ff.).

[5] *Cf.* the Dāmodarpur plates of the years 124 and 128. (Ep. xvii. 193.) The Baigram inscription of the year 128 (A.D. 447-48) refers to a *Kumārāmātya* named Kulavṛiddhi who governed a *vishaya* with its headquarters at Pañchanagarī possibly pañchabibi *or* Pañchgaḍ on the Karatoyā, *H. Standard* 14-10-47 in N. Bengal. *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 78 ff. Year Book, ASB, 1950, 200. The Sultanpur or Kalaikuḍi Inscription (Bangaśrī 1350 B. S. *Baiśākha*, pp. 415-51

held office in the province of Eraṇ (in Eastern Mālwa) which included Tumbavana[1]; a third viceroy or feudatory, Bandhuvarman, ruled at Daśapura in western Mālwa.[2] The Karamadāṇḍe inscription of A.D. 436 mentions Pṛithivisheṇa who was a *Mantrin* and *Kumārāmātya*, and afterwards *Mahā-balādhikṛita* or general under Kumāra Gupta, probably stationed in Oudh. The panegyrist of a Mālwa viceroy claims that the suzerainty of Kumāra Gupta extended over "the whole earth which is decked with the rolling seas as with a rocking girdle, which holds in its breast-like mountain altitudes the founts of the vivifying liquid, and smiles with the flowers of its forest glens."

Like his father, Kumāra was a tolerant king. During his rule the worship of *Svāmī* Mahāsena (Kārttikeya), of Buddha, of Śiva in the *liṅga* form and of the sun, as well as that of Vishṇu, flourished peacefully side by side.[3]

and *Bhādra*; IHQ, XIX. 12) of the year 120=A. D. 439 in the Bogra district, makes mention of another officer, the *Ayuktaka*, Achyutadāsa of Purṇakauśikā in Śriṅgaveravīthi. The Natore Inscription of A. D. 432 (JPASB, 1911) is another record of Kumāra's reign found in N. Bengal.

[1] Tumain in the Guna district of the Gwaliar state, about 50 miles to the north-west of Eraṇ. M. B. Garde, *Ind. Ant.*, xlix 1920, p. 114, *Ep. Ind.* xxvi (1941), pp. 115 ff; Tumain Inscription of the year 116, *i.e.*, A. D. 435. The identity of the prince mentioned in the record, with Śrī Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of seals and Ghaṭo Kramāditya of coins is uncertain (Allan, xvi, xl, liv) Hema Chandra (in the *Pariśishṭa parvan*, xii, 2-3) places Tumbavana in the Avantideśa, 'the ornament of the western half of Bhārata' in Jambūdvīpa.

Ihaiva Jambūdvīpe 'pāg Bharatārdhā vibhūshaṇam
Avantiriti deśo' sti svargadeśīya ṛiddhibhiḥ
tatra Tumbavanamiti vidyate sanniveśanam

[2] Mandasor Inscription of A. D. 437-38. Bhide suggests (*JBORS*, VII, March, 1921, pp. 33 f) that Viśva-varman of Gupta Ins. No. 17 is an independent king, who flourished a century before his namesake of ins. No. 18, who is a governor (*Goptṛi*) of the Guptas. S. Majumdar points out that even Viśva-varman of Ins. No. 17 must be later than Naravarman of V. S. 461 (=A. D. 404-05). In the Bihar Kotra (Rājgaḍh state, Mālwa) Ins. (*Ep. Ind.* xxvi. 130 ff) of Mahārāja Naravarman of the year 474 (*i.e.*, A. D. 417-18) the king is styled '*aulikara*', thus establishing his connection with Vishṇuvardhana of the Mālava Era 589 (A. D. 532-33).

[3] *Cf.* the Bilsaḍ, Mankuwār, Karamadāṇḍe and Mandasor inscriptions. Śiva appears to have been the favourite deity of many high ministers, Vishṇu of the most powerful ruling race and the sun of traders and artisans in the early Gupta period. The expression *Jitam Bhagavatā* appears to have been popularised by the king. His example seems to have been followed by Mādhava

The two notable events of Kumāra's reign are the celebration of the horse sacrifice, evidenced by the rare *Aśvamedha* type of his gold coinage, and the temporary eclipse of the Gupta power by the **Pushyamitras.** The reading Pushyamitra in the Bhitarī inscription is, however, not accepted by some scholars because the second syllable of this name is damaged.[1] Mr. H. R. Divekar in his article —"*Pusyamitras in the Gupta Period*"[2] makes the plausible emendation *Yudhy=amitrāṁś=ca* for Dr. Fleet's reading *Pusyamitrāṁs=ca* in the Bhitarī Pillar Inscription.[3] It is admitted on all hands that during the concluding years of Kumāra's reign the Gupta empire "had been made to totter." Whether the reference in the inscription is simply to *amitras* (enemies), or to Pushyamitras, cannot be satisfactorily determined. We should, however, remember in this connection that a people called Pushyamitra is actually referred to in the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* and a Pushyamitika-*Kula* in the Jain *Kalpasūtra.*[4] The Purāṇa text associates the Pushyamitras, Paṭumitras, Durmitras and others with the region of Mekala near the source of the Nerbudda.[5] References to the warlike activities of Mekala and the neighbouring realm of Kosala

Ganga of Penukonda plates (Ep. Ind. XIV. 334), Vishṇuvarman I Kadamba of Hebbata grant (Mys. A. S., A. R., 1925. 98), Nandivarman Pallava of Udayendiram (Ep. Ind., III. 145) and other kings of the south. The popularity of the cult of Kārttikeya is well illustrated not only by the sanctuaries erected in his honour, but also by the names Kumāra and Skanda assumed by members of the imperial family, and the issue of the peacock type of coins by the emperor Kumāra Gupta I. The Gupta empire reached the zenith of its splendour before its final decline in the time of the originator of the 'peacock' coins, as a later empire did in the days of the builder of the peacock-throne.

[1] *Cf.* Fleet, CII, p. 55 n.

[2] *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute,* 1919-20, 99 f.

[3] CII, iii, p. 55.

[4] SBE, XXII, 292. *Cf.* the legend *Pusamitasa* found on Bhīṭā seals in characters of the Kushān period or a somewhat earlier date (JRAS, 1911, 138).

[5] Vish., IV, 24. 17; Wilson, IX, 213. "Pushyamitra, and Paṭumitra and others to the number of 13 will rule over Mekalā." The commentary, however, distinguishes the 13 Pushyamitra-Paṭumitras from the 7 Mekalas. But from the context it is apparent that the position of the Pushyamitras was between the Māhishyas (people of Māhishmatī ?) and the Mekalas in the Nerbudda-Śon valleys if not in a part of the country of the Mekalas themselves. *Cf.* Fleet, JRAS, 1889, 228, *cf.* also Bhīṭā seals. For Mekalā see also *Ep. Ind.* xxvii 138 f.

that had once been overrun by Kumāra's grandfather, are found in inscriptions of the Vākāṭaka relations of Kumāra Gupta. Bāṇa relates the tragic story of a ruler of Magadha who was carried off by the ministers of the lord of Mekala. A passage in the Mankuwar stone image inscription of the year 129 (A.D. 449) where the emperor Kumāra Gupta I is styled simply *Mahārāja Śrī* instead of *Mahārājādhirāja Śrī* has been interpreted by some scholars to mean that he was possibly deprived by his enemies of his status as paramount sovereign. But the theory is rendered improbable by the Dāmodarpur plate of about the same date where Kumāra is given full imperial titles. It may be noted in this connection that in several inscriptions, and on certain coins, his immediate predecessors, too, are simply called *Rājā* or *Mahārāja*.

The assumption of the title *Vyāghra-bala-parākrama* "displaying the strength and prowess of a tiger", on coins of the *tiger-slayer* type, by Kumāra may possibly indicate that he attempted to repeat the southern venture of his grandfather and penetrate into the tiger-infested forest territory beyond the Nerbudda. Expansion towards the south is also indicated by a find of 1,395 coins in the Satara District.[1] But the imperial troops must have met with disaster. The fallen fortunes of the Gupta family were restored by prince Skanda Gupta who may have been appointed his father's warden in the Ghāzīpur region, the Aṭavi or Forest Country of ancient times.[2]

The only queen of Kumāra I named in the genealogical portion of extant inscriptions is Anantadevī. He had at least two sons, *viz.*, Puru Gupta, son of Anantadevī, and Skanda Gupta the name of whose mother is, in the opinion of some scholars, not given in the inscriptions. Sewell, however, suggests that it was Devakī.[3] This is not an unlikely assumption as otherwise the comparison of the

[1] Allan p. cxxx. *Cf.* also the Kadamba inscription referring to social relations between the Kadambas of the fifth century and the Guptas.

[2] *Cf.* the Bhitarī Inscription.

[3] *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, p. 349.

widowed Gupta empress with Kṛishṇa's mother in verse 6 of the Bhitarī Pillar Inscription will be less explicable. Hiuen Tsang calls Buddha Gupta (*Fo-to-kio-to*) or Budha Gupta,[1] a son (or descendant?) of Śakrāditya.[2] The only predecessor of Budha Gupta who had a synonymous title was Kumāra Gupta I who is called Mahendrāditya on coins. *Mahendra* is the same as *Śakra*. The use of terms conveying the same meaning as titles and epithets was not unknown in the Gupta period. *Vikramāditya* was also called *Vikramāṅka*. Skanda Gupta is called both *Vikramāditya* and *Kramāditya*, both the words meaning "puissant like the sun" or "striding like the sun." If Śakrāditya of Hiuen Tsang be identical with Mahendrāditya or Kumāra I, Budha Gupta[3] was closely related to Kumāra. Another member of Kumāra's family was possibly Ghaṭotkacha Gupta.[4]

SECTION III. SKANDA GUPTA VIKRAMĀDITYA.

According to the evidence of the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa*, confirmed by epigraphic testimony, the immediate successor of Mahendra, *i.e.*, Kumāra Gupta I, was Skanda Gupta. In an interesting paper read at a meeting of the *Asiatic Society of Bengal,* Dr. R. C. Majumdar sugges-

[1] The name *Fo-to-kio-to* has been restored as Buddha Gupta. But we have no independent evidence regarding the existence of a king named Buddha Gupta about this period. The synchronism of his successor's successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula indicates that the king meant was Budha Gupta, *cf.* also *Ind. Ant.*, 1886, 251 n.

[2] That Śakrāditya was a reality is proved by a Nālandā seal (H. Sastri, *MASI*, No. 66, p. 38). To him is ascribed an establishment at Nālandā, the far-famed place, which grew into a great university in the seventh century A.D. The pilgrim was not indulging in mere fancy as suggested by Śrī N. Śāstrī in a treatise on Nālandā.

[3] Recent discoveries show that Budha Gupta was really a *grandson* (*not a son*) of Kumāra Gupta I. The Chinese pilgrim may have failed to distinguish between a son and a grandson. Cf. The Kopparam plates where Pulakeśin II is represented as a grandson of Kīrtivarman I. But he was really the son of the latter. It is also possible that Śakrāditya was an epithet of Purugupta, the father of Budha.

[4] The Tumain Inscription referred to by Mr. Garde; *cf.* also the Basārh seal mentioning Śrī Ghaṭotkacha Gupta. The exact relationship with Kumāra is, however, not stated in the inscription.

ted that after Kumāra's death, which apparently took place while the struggle with the Pushyamitras was still undecided, there was a fratricidal war in which Skanda Gupta came off victorious after defeating his brothers including Puru Gupta, the rightful claimant, and rescued his mother just as Kṛishṇa rescued Devakī.[1] Dr. Majumdar observed that the omission of the name of the mother of Skanda Gupta in the genealogy given in the Bihār and Bhitarī Stone Pillar Inscriptions indicated that she was not the chief queen and Skanda 'had no natural claim to the throne'. The rightful heir of Kumāra was Puru Gupta, the son of the *Mahādevī* Anantadevī.

We should, however, remember that there was no rule prohibiting the mention of ordinary queens in inscriptions. The mother of Princess Prabhāvatī, Kuberanāgā, was not the chief queen of Chandra Gupta II.[2] No doubt the title *Mahādevī* is once given to her in the Poona plates of her daughter in the year 13, but it is not repeated in the Ṛiddhapur plates of the year 19, where she is called simply Kuberanāgā *devī* without the prefix *Mahādevī,* whereas Kumāra-devī, Datta-devī and even her own daughter, Prabhā vatī-guptā are styled *Mahādevīs*. The contrast is full of significance and we know as a matter of fact that the real *Mahādevī* (chief queen) of Chandra Gupta II was Dhruva-devī or Dhruva-Svāminī. Though Kuberanāgā was not the principal consort (*agramahishī*) of her husband, she is mentioned in the inscriptions of her daughter. On the other hand the names of queens, the mothers of kings, are sometimes omitted.[3] In the *genealogical portion* of the Banskhera and Madhuban *plates* the name of Yaśomatī *as Harsha's mother* is not mentioned, but in the Sonpat

[1] *Cf.* the Bhitarī Inscription, JASB, 1921 (N. S. XVII), 253 ff. In IC. 1944, 171, Dr. Majumdar modified his views regarding the omission of the name of the queen mother in the Bihar ins. and found the names of Mahādevī Anantadevī and her son Purugupta in the inscription.

[2] JASB, 1924, 58.

[3] The name of the father of a reigning king is also sometimes omitted (*cf.* Kielhorn's N. Ins. Nos. 464, 468).

and the Nālandā *seals*[1] she is mentioned *both* as the mother of Rājya-vardhana *and as the mother of Harsha.* Therefore it is not safe to draw conclusions from a comparison of genealogies given on **seals** and those given in **ordinary praśastis.** From a comparative study of the seals and plaques referred to above on the one hand and ordinary panegyrical epigraphs on the other, two facts emerge, *viz.*, (*a*) genealogies given by the records of the former class are *fuller* than those given in the others, and (*b*) names of mothers of reigning kings that are invariably given **(even though this meant repetition)** in documents of the first group are sometimes omitted by the writers of *praśastis*, even though they be the names of the chief queens. There is no real analogy between the genealogy on the Bhitarī **seal** and that in the **Pillar** Inscriptions. *A seal should be compared to another seal and an ordinary praśasti with another document of the same class.*[2]

As to the question of rightful claim to the succession, we should remember that the cases of Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II suggest that the ablest among the

[1] A. R. of the ASI, Eastern Circle, 1917-18, p. 44; *Ep. Ind.*, XXI. 74 ff. *MASI*, No. 66, 68 f.

[2] We have already seen that in the opinion of Sewell the name of Skanda's mother is actually mentioned in one epigraph. According to that scholar her name was Devakī. The comparison with Krishṇ's mother (who, with all her misfortunes, did not experience the pangs of widowhood) in the Bhitarī Inscription would be less explicable, if not altogether pointless, if Devakī was not the nam of the mother of Skanda Gupta as well as that of Kṛishṇa. Why were Kṛishṇa and Devakī thought of in connection with the victory over hostile powers, instead of, say, Skanda (Kārttikeya) and Pārvatī, Indra or Vishṇu and Aditi, by the panegyrist of Skanda Gupta who is compared to Śakra (*Śakropama*, Kahaum Inscription) and Vishṇu (*Śrīparikshiptavakshā*, Junāgaḍh epigraph)? A possible explanation is that the name of his mother coupled with her miserable plight suggested to the court-poet comparison with Kṛishṇa and Devakī. *Cf.* Ep. Ind. I, 364; xiii. 126, 131 (Hampe and Conjeeveram ins. of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya) where we have a similar play on the name Devakī:—

tadvaṁśe Devakījānirddidīpe Timma bhūpatiḥ
yaśasvī Tuluvendreshu Yadoḥ Kṛishṇa ivānvaye...
sarasādudabhūttasmān Narasāvanipālakaḥ
Devakīnaṁdanāt (var. °nandanaḥ) Kāmo Devaki naṁdanādiva.

The problem, however, is not free from difficulties and its final solution must await fresh discoveries.

princes was chosen irrespective of any claim arising out of birth.

There is nothing to show that the struggle at the end of Kumāra's reign, referred to in the Bhitarī Pillar Inscription, was a fratricidal conflict. The relevant text of the inscription runs thus:

Pitari divam upētē viplutāṁ vaṁśa-lakshmīṁ
bhuja-bala-vijit-ārir-yyaḥ pratishṭhāpya bhūyaḥ
jitam-iti paritoshān mātaraṁ sāsra-nettrāṁ
hata-ripur-iva Kṛishṇa Devakīm-abhyupetaḥ.

"Who, when (his) father had attained heaven (*i.e.*, died), vanquished (his) enemies by the strength of (his) arm, and steadied once more the drifting fortunes of his family; and then exclaiming 'the victory has been won' betook himself, like Kṛishṇa, when his enemies had been slain, to his weeping mother, Devakī."[1]

The hostile powers (*ari*), who made the *Vaṁsa-lakshmī*, goddess of family fortune, of Skanda Gupta "*vipluta*," 'convulsed,' after the death of his father, were apparently enemies of the Gupta family, *i.e.*, outsiders not belonging to the Gupta line. As a matter of fact the antagonists expressly mentioned in the Bhitarī Pillar Inscription were outsiders, *e.g.*, the Pushyamitras[2] and the Hūṇas. There is not the slightest reference to a fratricidal war. There is no doubt a passage in the Junāgaḍh Inscription of Skanda which says that "the goddess of fortune and splendour (Lakshmī) of her own accord selected (Skanda) as her husband (*svayaṁ varayaṁ-chakāra*)...having discarded all the other sons of kings (*manujendra-putra*)." But "*Svayameva śriyā gṛihīta*" "ac-

[1] For the reference to Devakī, see *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, V, 79.

[2] Even if the reference be merely to "*amitras*" (see *ante*, p. 568), these *amitras* could not have included an elder brother, as the passage "*kshitipa-charaṇapīṭhe sthāpita vāma-pādaḥ*," "placed (his) left foot on a foot-stool which was the king (of that hostile power himself)" clearly shows. The expression *samudita bala kosha* ("whose power and wealth had risen") would be singularly inappropriate in the case of the rightful heir to the imperial throne of the Guptas with its enormous resources existing for several generations, and can only point to a *parvenu* power that had suddenly leaped to fame.

cepted by Śrī or Lakshmī of her own accord" is an epithet which is applied by Prabhākara-vardhana, shortly before his death, to Harsha whose devotion to his elder brother is well-known. That Skanda Gupta like Harsha was considered to be the favourite of the Goddess of Luck is well-known. Attention may be invited to the Lakshmī type of his coins[1] and the epithet *Śrī-parikshiptavakshāḥ* ("whose breast is embraced by Śrī, *i.e.*, Lakshmī"), occurring in the Junāgaḍh Inscription. The panegyrist of the emperor refers to a *svayambara* in the conventional style.[2] A *svayambara* naturally presupposes an assemblage of princes, not necessarily of one particular family, in which all the suitors are discarded excepting one. But there is no inseparable connection between a *svayambara* and a fight, and, even when it is followed by a fight, the combatants are hardly ever princes who are sons of the same king. The epigraphic passage referring to Lakshmī's *svayambara*, therefore, does not *necessarily* imply that there was a *struggle* between the *sons of Kumāra* in which Skanda came off victorious. It only means that among the princes he was specially fortunate and was considered to be the best fitted to rule because of the valiant fight he had put up against the enemies of the family and empire. In the Allahabad *praśasti* we have a similar passage:—"who (Samudra Gupta) being looked at with envy by the faces, melancholy through the rejection of themselves, of others of equal birth...was bidden by his father,—who exclaiming 'verily he is worthy' embraced him—to govern of a surety the whole world." It may be argued that there is no proof that Skanda was selected by Kumāra. On the contrary he is said to have been selected by Lakshmī of her own accord. But such was also the case with Harsha. Skanda like Harsha was called upon to save the empire of

[1] Allan, p. xcix.
[2] Cf. *Ep. Ind.*, I. 25.
Gūrjjareśvara-rājya-Śrīr
yasya jajñe svayambarā
The *Svayambara* of Lakshmī forms the subject of the drama which Urvaśī acts before Indra with her sister nymphs (JASB, 59, 32).

his forbears at a time when the fortunes of the imperial family were at a low ebb, and both these eminent men owed their success to their own prowess. The important thing to remember is that the avowed enemies of Skanda Gupta mentioned in his inscriptions were outsiders like the Pushyamitras, Hūṇas,[1] and Mlechchhas.[2] The *manu-jendra-putras* of the Junāgaḍh Inscription are mentioned only as disappointed suitors, not as defeated enemies, comparable to the brothers of Samudra Gupta who were discarded by Chandra Gupta I. We are, therefore, inclined to think that as the tottering Gupta empire was saved from its enemies (*e.g.*, the Pushyamitras) by Skanda Gupta it was he who was considered to be the best fitted to rule. There is no evidence that his brothers disputed his claim and actually fought for the crown. There is nothing to show that Skanda shed his brothers' blood and that the epithets "*amalātmā*," 'pure-souled,' and "*parahita-kārī*," 'the benefactor of others,' applied to him in the Bhitarī Inscription and coin legends,[3] were unjustified.

The view that Skanda Gupta was the immediate successor of Kumāra Gupta I seems to be confirmed by a verse in the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*[4] which runs thus:—

Samudrākhya nṛipaśchaiva
Vikramaśchaiva kīrtitaḥ
Mahendranṛipavaro mukhyaḥ
Sakārādyam ataḥ param
Devarājākhya nāmāsau yugādhame

It is impossible not to recognise in the kings (*nṛipa*) Samudra, Vikrama, Mahendra and "Sākārādya" mentioned in the verse, the great Gupta emperors Samudra Gupta, Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, Kumāra Gupta I, Mahendrāditya and Skanda Gupta.[5]

[1] Bhitarī Ins.

[2] Junāgaḍh Ins.

[3] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, cxxi.

[4] Vol. I, ed. Ganapati Śāstri, p. 628. *Cf.* the Rewa Ins. of 141 = A.D. 460/61. Attention was drawn to this record by Mr. B. C. Chhabra at the Oriental Conference, Twelfth (Benares) Session, Summaries of Papers, part II, p. 39 and later by Drs. Majumdar and Sircar.

[5] IHQ, 1932, p. 352.

Skanda Gupta assumed the titles of *Kramāditya* and *Vikramāditya*.[1] The passage from the *Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* quoted above refers to his appellation *Devarāja*. The titles Vikramāditya and Devarāja were apparently assumed in imitation of his grandfather. The latter epithet reminds one further of the name Mahendra given to his father. It is also to be noted that in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription Samudra Gupta is extolled as the equal of Indra and other gods and in the Kahāum record Skanda Gupta is called *Śakropama*.

From the evidence of coins and inscriptions we know that Skanda ruled from A.D. 455 to *c.* 467. The first achievement of the monarch was the resuscitation of the Gupta Empire and the recovery of lost provinces. From an inscriptional passage we learn that while preparing to restore the fallen fortunes of his family he was reduced to such straits that he had to spend a whole night sleeping on the bare earth. Line twelve of the Bhitarī Inscription tells us that when Kumāra Gupta I had attained heaven, Skanda conquered his enemies by the strength of his arms. From the context it seems that these enemies were the Pushyamitras "whose power and wealth had (suddenly) gone up."

The struggle with the Pushyamitras was followed by conflicts with the Hūṇas[2] and probably also with the Vākāṭakas in which the emperor was presumably victorious in the end. The invasion of the Hūṇas took place not later than A.D. 458 if we identify them with the *Mlechchhas* or barbarian uitlanders of the Junāgaḍh Inscription. The

[1] Allan, *Catalogue*, pp. 117, 122; *cf.* Fleet, CII, p. 58:—
"*Vinaya-bala-sunītair* vikramena kramena
pratidinam-abhiyogād īpsitaṁ yena labdhvā."

The epithet Kramāditya is found on certain gold coins of the heavy Archer type as well as on silver issues of the Garuḍa, Bull and Altar types. The more famous title of Vikramāditya is met with on silver coins of the Altar type.

[2] The Hūṇas are mentioned not only in inscriptions, but in the *Mahābhārata*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Raghuvaṁśa* and later in the *Harsha-charita* and the *Nītivākyāmṛita* of Somadeva. The *Lalita Vistara* (translated by Dharmaraksha, *d.* A. D. 313) mentions the *Hūṇalipi* (Ind. Ant., 1913, p. 266). See also W. M. McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia*, 399ff, 455ff, 485f.

memory of the victory over the *Mlechchhas* is preserved in the story of king Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya of Ujjain, in Somadeva's *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*.[1] Central India and Surāshṭra seem to have been the vulnerable parts of the Gupta Empire. The Bālāghāṭ plates[2] refer to Narendrasena Vākāṭaka, son of Skanda Gupta's cousin Pravarasena II (III?) as "*Kosalā-Mekalā-Mālav-ādhipatyabhyarchitaśāsana*" 'whose commands were treated with respect by the lords of Kosalā (Upper Mahānadī Valley), Mekalā (Upper Valley of the Nerbudda and the Śon), and Mālava (probably Eastern Mālwa). The Junāgaḍh Inscription tells us that Skanda "deliberated for days and nights before making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Surāshṭras." Allan deduces from this and from the words "*sarveshu deśeshu vidhāya goptṛīn*" 'appointing protectors in all the provinces' that the emperor was at particular pains to appoint a series of Wardens of the Marches to protect his dominions from future invasion. One of these Wardens was Parṇadatta,[3] governor of Surāshṭra. In spite of all his efforts Skanda Gupta could not, however, save the westernmost part of his empire from future troubles. During his lifetime he no doubt, retained his hold over Surāshṭra, the Cambay coast and the adjoining portions of continental Gujarāṭ and Mālwa.[4] But his successors do not appear to have been so fortunate. Not a single inscription or coin has yet

[1] Allan, *Gupta Coins*, Introduction, p. xlix.

[2] *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 271.

[3] Persian Farna-dāta seems, according to Jarl Charpentier, to be the form underlying the name Parṇadatta (*JRAS*, 1931, 140; *Aiyangar Com. Vol.*, 15).

[4] The inclusion of Surāshṭra within his empire is proved by the Junāgaḍh Inscription and that of the Cambay coast by silver coins of the 'Bull type'. The type was imitated by Kṛishṇarāja (Allan, ci), who is to be identified with the king of that name belonging to the Kaṭachchuri family. Kṛishṇa's son and successor, Saṁkaragaṇa appropriates the epithets of the great Samudra Gupta. His son Buddharāja effected the conquest of Eastern Mālwa early in the seventh century A. D. (c. 608 A. D.; Vaḍner plates, Ep. Ind., xii, 31 ff.; see also Marshall, *A Guide to Sāñchī*, p. 21n). The dynasty was overthrown by the early Chalukyas and it is interesting to note that three of the characteristic epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya Vijaya-rāja in the Kaira grant; Fleet, CII, 14.

been discovered which shows that Surāshṭra and Western Mālwa formed parts of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta. On the contrary Harisheṇa Vākāṭaka, cousin of Narendrasena, claims victories over Lāṭa (South Gujarāṭ) and Avanti (district around Ujjain) besides Trikūṭa in the Koṅkan, Kuntala (the Kanarese country), Andhra (the Telugu country), Kaliṅga (South Orissa and some adjoining tracts), and Kosala (Upper Mahānadī Valley), while the Maitrakas of Valabhī (Wala in the peninsular portion of Gujarāṭ) gradually assume independence.

The later years of Skanda seem to have been tranquil.[1] The emperor was helped in the work of administration by a number of able governors like Parṇadatta, viceroy of the west, Sarvanāga, District Officer (*Vishayapati*) of Antarvedī or the Gangetic Doāb and Bhīmavarman, the ruler of the Kosam region.[2] Chakrapālita, son of Parṇadatta, restored in A.D. 457-58 the embankment of the lake Sudarśana at Girnar which had burst two years previously.

The emperor continued the tolerant policy of his forefathers. Himself a *Bhāgavata* or worshipper of Kṛishṇa-Vishṇu, he and his officers did not discourage followers of other sects, *e.g.*, Jainas and devotees of the Sun. The people were also tolerant. The Kahāum Inscription commemorates the erection of Jaina images by a person "full of affection for Brāhmaṇas."[3] The Indore plate records a deed by a Brāhmaṇa endowing a lamp in a temple of the Sun.

[1] *Cf.* the Kahāum Ins. of 141 = A.D. 460-1.

[2] The inclusion within Skanda's empire of provinces lying still further to the east is proved by the Bhitarī and Bihār Pillar Inscriptions and possibly by gold coins of the Archer type struck on a standard of 144.6 grains of metal. Allan, p. xcviii, 118.

[3] *Cf.* The Pāhāḍpur epigraph of the year 159 (A.D. 479) which records a donation made by a Brāhmaṇa couple for the worship of the Divine Arhats, *i.e.*, the Jinas.

CHAPTER XII. THE GUPTA EMPIRE (*continued*): THE LATER GUPTAS

Vasvaukasāramatibhūya sāhaṁ
saurājya vaddhotsavayā bibhūtyā
samagraśaktau tvayi Sūryavaṁśye
sati prapannā karuṇāmavasthām

—*Raghuvaṁśam.*

SECTION I. SURVIVAL OF THE GUPTA POWER AFTER SKANDA GUPTA

It is now admitted on all hands that the reign of Skanda Gupta ended about A.D. 467.[1] When he passed away the empire declined,[2] especially in the west, but did not wholly perish. We have epigraphic as well as literary evidence of the continuance of the Gupta Empire in parts of Central and Eastern India in the latter half of the fifth as well as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. The Dāmodarpur plates, the Sārnāth Inscriptions[3] and the Eraṇ epigraph of Budha Gupta prove that from A.D. 477 to 496 the Gupta Empire extended from Bengal to Eastern Mālwa. The Betul plates of the *Parivrājaka Mahāraja* Saṁkshobha, dated in the year 199 G. E., *i.e.*, 518 A.D., 'during the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta King,"[4] testify to the fact that the Gupta sway at this period was acknowledged in Ḍabhālā, which included the Tripuri *Vishaya* (Jabbalpur region).[5] Another inscription of Saṁkshobha found in the valley near the village of Khoh

[1] Smith, *The Oxford History of India*, additions and corrections, p. 171, end.

[2] For the probable causes of decline, see *Calcutta Review*, April, 1930, p. 36 ff; also *post*. 626 ff.

[3] A.S.I. Report, 1914-15; *Hindusthan Review*, Jan., 1918; JBORS, IV, 344 f.

[4] *Srīmati pravardhamāna vijaya-rājye saṁvatsara-śate nava-navaty-uttare Gupta-nripa-rājya bhuktau.* "In the glorious, augmenting and victorious reign, in a century of years increased by ninety-nine, in the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta King."

[5] Ep. Ind., VIII, pp. 284-87. Ḍabhālā = later Ḍāhala.

in Baghēlkhaṇḍ, dated in A.D. 528, proves that the Gupta Empire included some of the central districts even in A.D. 528.[1] Fifteen years later the grant of a village in the Koṭivarsha *Vishaya* (Dinājpur District) of Puṇḍravardhana-*bhukti* (roughly North Bengal) 'during the reign of *Paramadaivata* (the Supreme Divinity) *Parama-bhaṭṭāraka* (the Supreme Lord) *Mahārājādhirāja* (King of Kings) *Srī............Gupta*,'[2] shows that the Gupta dominions at this period included the eastern as well as the central provinces. Towards the close of the sixth century a Gupta king, a contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti[3] family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānēsar), was ruling in "Mālava."[4] Two sons of this king, Kumāra Gupta and

[1] Fleet, CII, III, pp. 113-16, Hoernle in JASB, 1889, p 95

[2] Ep. Ind., XV, p. 113 ff. Corrected in Ep. Ind., XVII (Jan., 1924), p. 193.

[3] This seems to be the correct spelling and not Pushpabhūti (Ep. Ind., I. 68).

[4] "Mālava" was graced by the presence of the Guptas as early as the fifth century. This is proved by the Udayagiri inscriptions of Chandragupta II and the Tumain inscription of Ghatotkacha Gupta. In the latter part of the sixth and the commencement of the seventh century, it seems to have been under the direct rule of a line of Guptas whose precise connection with the Great Guptas is not clear. Magadha was probably administered by local rulers like *Kumārāmātya Mahārāja* Nandana (A. D. 551-2?) of the Amauna plate, Gayā Dist., Ep. Ind., X, 49, and the Varmans (*cf.* Nāgārjuni Hill Cave Ins., CII, 226; also Pūrṇavarman mentioned by Hiuen Tsang and Devavarman, IA, X, 110). For a detailed discussion see Ray Chaudhuri, *JBORS*, XV, parts *iii* and *iv* (1929, pp. 651 f.). The precise location and extent of the "Mālava" of the "later Guptas" cannot be determined. In Ep. Ind., V, 229, the *Daṇḍanāyaka* Anantapāla, a feudatory of Vikramāditya VI, is said to have subdued the *Sapta* Mālava countries up to the Himālaya Mountains. This suggests that there were as many as seven countries called Mālava (*cf.*, also Rice, *Mysore and Coorg*, 46). These were probably: (1) The country of the 'Mālavas' in the Western Ghats (*Kanarese Districts*, p. 569), (2) Mo-la-po Mālavaka *āhāra* of Valabhī grants on the Mahī governed by the Maitrakas, (3) Avanti in the wider sense of the term ruled by the Kaṭachchuris or Kalachuris of the Abhona plates (sixth century) and by a Brāhmaṇa family in the time of Hiuen Tsang Chinese pilgrim, (4) *Pūrva* Mālava (round Bhilsa), (5) District round Prayāga, Kauśāmbī and Fatehpur in U. P. (Smith, EHI, 4th ed., p. 350n, ; IHQ. 1931. 150f.; *cf.* JRAS, 1903, 561), (6) part of eastern Rājputāna, (7) Cis-Sutlej districts of the Pañjāb together with some Himālayan territory. The later Guptas probably held (4) and (5) and at times, Magadha as well. The *Bhāgvata Purāṇa* (xii, 1. 36) whose date is not probably far removed from that of the later Guptas, associates Malava with Arbuda (Abu) and distinguishes it from Avanti. The rulers of Mālava and Avanti are also distinguished from each other by Rājaśekhara in his *Viddhaśāla bhañjikā*, Act IV (p. 121 of Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's edition). Early, in the seventh

Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon the princes Rājya-vardhana and Harsha of Thānesar. From the Aphsaḍ Inscription of Ādityasena we learn that the fame of the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha,[1] marked with honour of victory in war over Susthitavarman, doubtless a king of Kāmarūpa, was constantly sung on the bank of the river Lohitya or Brahmaputra. This indicates that even in or about A.D. 600 (the time of Prabhākara-vardhana) the sway of kings bearing the name Gupta extended from "Mālava" to the Brahmaputra.[2]

In the sixth century Gupta suzerainty was no doubt successively challenged by the Huns and their conquerors belonging to the Mandasor and Maukhari families. In the first half of the seventh century the Guptas lost Vidiśā to the Kaṭachchuris and their power in the Ganges Valley was overshadowed by that of Harsha. But, after the death of the great Kanauj monarch, the "Gupta" empire was sought to be revived by Ādityasena, son of Mādhava Gupta, who "ruled the whole earth up to the shores of the oceans," performed the *Aśvamedha* and other great sacrifices and assumed the titles of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* and *Mahārājādhirāja.*

century the Guptas seem to have lost Eastern Mālwa to the Kaṭachchuris. In the Vadner plates issued from Vidiśā (Besnagar) in or about A.D. 608, a Kaṭachchuri king, Śaṁkaragaṇa received epithets that are palpably borrowed from the Allahabad *Praśasti* of Samudra Gupta. The overthrow of the Kaṭachchuris was effected by the early Chalukyas of Badami and South Gujarāṭ. Fleet points out (CII, 14) that three of the epithets of Samudra Gupta are applied to the Chalukya chieftain Vijayarāja in the Kaira grant of the year 394 (IA. VII 248). Ādityasena of the later Gupta family, who ruled in the second half of the seventh century A.D., seems to be referred to in Nepalese inscriptions as 'King of Magadha'. Magadha, now replaced Eastern Mālwa as the chief centre of Gupta power.

[1] *Cf.* Hoernle in JRAS, 1903, 561.

[2] An allusion to the later Guptas seems to occur in the *Kādambari*, Verse 10, of Bāṇa which says that the lotus feet of Kubera, the poet's great-grandfather, were worshipped by many a Gupta:—

> Babhūva *Vātsyāyana vaṁśa saṁbhavo*
> *dvijo jagadgītaguṇo'graṇīḥ satām*
> *aneka Guptārchitapāda paṅkajaḥ*
> *Kubera nāmāṁśa iva Svayaṁbhuvaḥ.*

SECTION II. PURU GUPTA AND NARASIMHA GUPTA BALADITYA

We shall now proceed to give an account of Skanda Gupta's successors. The immediate successor of the great emperor seems to have been his brother **Puru Gupta.** The existence of this king was unknown till the discovery of the Bhitarī seal of Kumāra Gupta II in 1889, and its publication by Smith and Hoernle.[1] The seal describes Puru Gupta as the son of Kumāra I by the queen Anantadevī, and does not mention Skanda Gupta. The mention of Puru Gupta immediately after Kumāra with the prefix *tat-pād-ānudhyāta* "meditating on, or attached to, the feet of" (Kumāra), does not necessarily prove that Puru Gupta was the immediate successor of his father, and a contemporary and rival of his brother or half-brother Skanda Gupta.[2] In the Manahali grant Madanapāla is described as *Śrī-Rāmapāla-Deva-pādānudhyāta,* although he was preceded by his elder brother Kumārapāla. In Kielhorn's Northern Inscription No. 39, Vijayapāla is described as the successor of Kshitipāla, although he was preceded by his brother Devapāla.[3] Smith and Allan have shown that Skanda ruled over the whole empire including the eastern and the central as well as many of the western provinces. He may have lost some of his districts in the Far West. But the coin-

[1] JASB, 1889, pp. 84-105.

[2] The omission of Skanda's name in the Bhitarī seal of his brother's grandson does not necessarily imply that the relations between him and Puru's family were unfriendly as suggested by Mr. R. D. Banerji (*cf. Annals of the Bhand. Ins.*, 1918-19, pp. 74-75). The name of Pulakeśin II is omitted in an inscription of his brother and *Yuvarāja* Vishṇuvardhana (Sātārā grant, *Ind. Ant.*, 1890, pp. 227f). The name of Bhoja II of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty is not mentioned in the Partabgarh Inscription of his nephew Mahendrapāla II, but it is mentioned in an inscription of his brother Vināyakapāla, the father of Mahendrapāla. Besides, there was no custom prohibiting the mention of the name of a rival uncle or brother. Maṅgaleśa and Govinda II are mentioned in the inscriptions of the rivals and their descendants. On the other hand even an ancestor of a reigning king was sometimes omitted, *e.g.*, Dharapaṭṭa is omitted in his son's inscription (Kielhorn, N. Ins., No. 464).

[3] Kielhorn, Ins. No. 31.

types of the successors of Kumāra Gupta, with the exception of Skanda Gupta and Budha Gupta, show that none of them could have held sway in the lost territories of Western India. Epigraphic and numismatic evidence clearly indicates that there was no room for a rival *Mahārājādhirāja* in Northern India including Bihār and Bengal during the reign of Skanda Gupta. He was a man of mature years at the time of his death *cir.* A.D. 467.[1] His brother and successor Puru Gupta, too, must have been an old man at that time. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that he had a very short reign and died some time before A.D. 473 when his grandson Kumāra Gupta II was ruling. The name of Puru Gupta's queen has been read by various scholars as Śrī Vatsadevī, Vainyadevī or Śrī Chandradevī.[2] She was the mother of Narasiṁha Gupta Bālāditya.

The coins of Puru Gupta are of the heavy Archer type apparently belonging to the eastern provinces of the empire of his predecessors.[3] Some of the coins hitherto attributed to him have the reverse legend Śrī Vikramaḥ[4] and possible traces of the fuller title of Vikramāditya. Allan identifies him with king Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā, father of Bālāditya, who was a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu. The importance of this identification lies in the fact that it proves that the immediate successors of Skanda Gupta had a capital at Ayodhyā probably till the rise of the Maukharis. If the spurious Gayā plate is to be believed Ayodhyā was the

[1] When sons succeed a father or mother after a prolonged reign they are usually well advanced in years. In the case of Skanda Gupta we know that already in A.D. 455 he was old enough to lead the struggle against all the enemies of his house and empire in succession. *Cf.* 566 n. 3 *ante*.

[2] Ep. Ind., XXI. 77; ASI, AR, 1934-35, 63.

[3] Allan, pp. Lxxx, xcviii.

[4] Mr. S. K. Sarasvati attributes these coins to Budha Gupta (*Indian Culture*, I, 692). This view, however, is not accepted by Prof. Jagan Nath (*Summaries of papers submitted to the 13th All India Oriental Conference*, Nagpur, 1946, Sec. IX, p. 11). According to Mr. Jagan Nath the reading is definitely Puru and not Budha. As to the title Vikramāditya, see Allan, p. cxxii. Dr. R. C. Majumdar (ASB, 4-4-49) adduces evidence in support of the view of Mr. Sarasvati.

seat of a Gupta *jaya-skandhāvāra*, or 'camp of victory,' as early as the time of Samudra Gupta. The principal capital of Bālāditya and his successors appears to have been Kāśī.[1]

The identification proposed by Allan also suggests that Puru Gupta could not have flourished much later than 472 A.D., for a Chinese history of the Indian patriarchs belonging to that year mentions "Ba-su-ban-da."[2]

The evidence of the Bharsar hoard seems to show that a king styled Prakāśāditya came shortly after Skanda Gupta. Prakāśāditya may be regarded as possibly a *biruda* or secondary epithet of Puru Gupta or of one of his immediate successors. Even if we think with Allan that Puru had the title Vikramāditya there is no inherent improbability in his having an additional *Āditya* title. That the same king might have two "*Āditya*" names is proved by the cases of Skanda Gupta (Vikramāditya and Kramāditya) and Śīlāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhī. But the identification of Prakāśāditya still remains *sub judice*. His coins are of the combined horseman and lion-slayer type. The "horseman type" was associated with the southern provinces of the empire of the Guptas[3] and the lion-slayer type with the north.[4]

Puru Gupta seems to have been succeeded by his son **Narasiṁha Gupta Bālāditya.** This king has been identified with king Bālāditya whose troops are represented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned the tyrant Mihirakula. It has been overlooked that Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was the immediate successor of Tathāgata Gupta[5] who was himself the immediate successor of Bud(d)ha Gupta.[6]

[1] *CII*, 285.

[2] *JRAS*, 1905, 40. This is now confirmed by the seal which represents Puru as the father of Budha (476-95).

[3] Allan, p. lxxxvi.

[4] *Ibid.*, xci.

[5] *Life of Hiuen Tsang*, p. 111. *Si-yu-ki*, II, p. 168.

[6] *Fo-to-kio-to*. Beal, Fleet and Watters render the term by Buddha Gupta, a name unknown to imperial Gupta epigraphy. The synchronism of his second successor Bālāditya with Mihirakula proves that Budha Gupta is meant. We have other instances of corruption of names, *e.g.* Skanda is

whereas Narasiṁha Gupta Bālāditya was the son and successor of Puru Gupta who in his turn was the son of Kumāra Gupta I and the successor of Skanda Gupta. The son and successor of Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was Vajra[1] while the son and successor of Narasiṁha was Kumāra Gupta II. It is obvious that the conqueror of Mihirakula was not the son of Puru Gupta but an altogether different individual.[2] The existence of several kings of the eastern part of the *Madhyadēśa* having the *biruda* Bālāditya is proved by the Sārnāth Inscription of Prakaṭāditya.[3] Narasiṁha Gupta must have died in or about the year A.D. 473. He was succeeded by his son Kumāra Gupta II Kramāditya by queen Mitradevī.[4]

The coins of Narasiṁha and his successor belong to two varieties of the Archer type. One class of these coins was, according to Allan, apparently intended for circulation in the lower Ganges valley, and the other may have been issued in the upper provinces. The inclusion of Eastern India within the dominions of Bālāditya (*Bālākhya*) and Kumāra (II) is vouched for by the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa.*[5]

transformed into Skandha in several Purāṇic lists of the so-called Andhra dynasty.

[1] *Yuan Chwang* II, p. 165.

[2] Drs. Bhaṭṭasālī and Basāk, who uphold the identification of Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya with the son of Puru Gupta, do not apparently attach due weight to the evidence of the *Life of Hiuen Tsang*, p. 111, which, as we shall see later on, is corroborated by the combined testimony of the Sārnāth inscription of Prakaṭāditya and the *Ārya-Mañju-śrī-mūla-kalpa*. The evidence of these documents suggests that Hiuen Tsang's Bālāditya was identical with Bhānu Gupta and was the father of Prakaṭāditya and Vajra.

[3] *CII*, p. 285. A Bālāditya is mentioned in the Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarman (*Ep. Ind.*, 1929, Jan., 38) and also a seal (*Śrī Nālandāyām Śrī Bālāditya Gandhakuḍī*, MASI, 66, 38).

[4] It is suggested in *Ep. Ind.*, xxi, 77 (clay seals of Nālandā) and *ASI, AR*, 1934-35, 63, that the name of Kumāra Gupta's mother has to be read as Mitradevī and not Śrīmatī devī or Lakshmīdevī.

[5] Ganapati Śāstrī's ed., p. 630. *Cf.* Jayaswal, *Imperial History*, 35.

Bālākhya nāmasau nṛipatir bhavitā Pūrva-deśakaḥ
tasyāpareṇa nṛipatiḥ Gauḍāṇām prabhavishṇavaḥ
Kumārākhyo nāmataḥ proktaḥ so'pir atyanta dharmavān.

SECTION III. KUMARA GUPTA II AND VISHNUGUPTA

Kumāra Gupta II of the Bhitarī seal, son of Narasiṁha Gupta, has been identified with Kramāditya of certain coins of the Archer type that are closely connected with the issues of Narasiṁha Bālāditya. He is also identified with king Kumāra Gupta mentioned in the Sārnāth Buddhist Image Inscription of the year 154 G. E., *i.e.*, A.D. 473-74.[1] Drs. Bhaṭṭasālī, Basāk and some other scholars think that the Kumāra Guptas of the Bhitarī seal and the Sārnāth epigraph were distinct individuals. The former places Kumāra, son of Narasiṁha, long after A.D. 500[2]. But his theory is based upon the doubtful identification of Narasiṁha, with the conqueror of Mihirakula. According to Dr. Basāk Kumāra of the Sārnāth Inscription was the immediate successor of Skanda. In his opinion there were two rival Gupta lines ruling simultaneously, one consisting of Skanda, Kumāra of Sārnāth and Budha, the other comprising Puru, Narasiṁha and his son Kumāra of the Bhitarī seal. But there is not the slightest evidence of a partition of the Gupta Empire in the latter half of the fifth century A.D. On the contrary inscriptions and coins prove that both Skanda and Budha ruled over the whole empire from Bengal to the West. We have already seen that according to the traditional account of the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* the kingdom of Bālākhya, *i.e.*, Bālāditya and his successor Kumāra embraced the *Purva-deśa* (Eastern India) including Gauḍa (Western and part of Northern Bengal).[3] How can we reconcile the rule of these kings with the contemporary sovereignty of a rival line represented by Skanda and Budha?[4] There

[1] See *ASI*, *AR*, 1914-15, 124, *Hindusthan Review*, Jan., 1918, *Ann. Bhand. Inst.*, 1918-19, 67 ff. and *JBORS*, iv, 344, 412, for the views of Venis, Pathak, Panday, Pannalall and others.

[2] *Dacca Review*, May and June, 1920, pp. 54-57.

[3] *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*, G. Śāstrī's ed., pp. 630 f.

[4] The seal of Budha Gupta (*MASB*, No. 66, p. 64) proves conclusively that Budha, far from belonging to a rival line, was actually a son of Puru Gupta. It also negatives the late date for Puru Gupta suggested by Dr. Bhaṭṭasālī.

is no cogent reason for doubting the identity of Kumāra of the Bhitarī seal with his namesake of the Sārnāth Inscription.

Kumāra II's reign must have terminated in or about the year A.D. 476-77, the first known date of Budha Gupta[1]. The reigns of Puru, Narasiṁha and Kumāra II appear to be abnormally short, amounting together to only ten years (A.D. 467-77). This is by no means a unique case. In Veṅgī three Eastern Chālukya monarchs, *viz.*, Vijayāditya IV, his son Ammarāja I, and Ammarāja's son, another Vijayāditya, ruled only for seven years and six and a half months.[2] In Kaśmīra six kings, Śūravarman I, Pārtha, Śambhuvardhana, Chakravarman, Unmattāvanti and Śūravarman II, ruled within six years (A.D. 933-39); and three generations of kings, *viz.*, Yaśaskara, his uncle Varṇaṭa, and his son Saṁgrāmadeva ruled for ten years (A.D. 939-49). A fragmentary seal discovered at Nālandā

[1] One of the successors of Kumāra (II), son of Bālāditya, is according to the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*, a prince styled *Ukārākhya*. That appellation may according to Jayaswal apply to Prakāśāditya, for Allan finds the letters *ru* or *u* on his coins. But the identification of a prince whose designation was *u*, (*Ukārākhya*), with Budha Gupta (Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India*, 38), does not seem to be plausible. The passage in the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* suggests a name like Upagupta, Upendra. Though there is no direct epigraphic evidence for the name Upagupta, the existence of such a prince does not seem to be improbable in view of the fact that an Upaguptā is mentioned in Maukhari records as the mother of Īśānavarman [Āśirgaḍh (Fleet, *CII*, p. 220) and Nālandā (*Ep. Ind.*, xxi, p. 74) seals]. *Cf.* Bhānu Gupta and Bhānu Guptā, Harsha Gupta and Harsha Guptā, Mahāsena Gupta and Mahāsena Guptā. On the analogy of these cases it is possible that there was a prince named Upagupta, apparently the brother of Upaguptā. If this surmise be correct Upagupta may have to be placed in the same period as the mother of Īśānavarman, *i.e.*, in the first half of the sixth century A.D., sometime after Budha Gupta. If u is the initial of *Upendra* (Vishṇu or Kṛishṇa) and not of *Upagupta*, it may refer to Vishṇu Gupta or to Krishṇa Gupta, just as *Somākhya* has reference to the Gauḍa king Śaśāṅka. The existence of a son of Kumāra Gupta II named *Mahārājādhirāja* Śrī Vishṇu Gupta has recently been disclosed by a fragmentary seal at Nālandā (*Ep. Ind.*, xxvi. 235; *IHQ*, XIX. 19). It is difficult in the present state of our knowledge to say whether he was the immediate successor of his father, or had to wait till the death of his great uncle Budha Gupta. Those who place him and his father *after* Budha Gupta, have to dissociate Kumāra of the Bhitarī and Nālandā seals from the homonymous prince of Sārnāth. This is not improbable but must await future discoveries for confirmation.

[2] Hultzsch, *SII*, Vol. I. p. 46.

refers to Kumāra's son **Vishṇu Gupta** who is probably to be identified with Chandrāditya of the coins.

SECTION IV. BUDHA GUPTA

For Budha Gupta, now known to have been a son of Puru Gupta[1] we have a number of dated inscriptions and coins which prove that he ruled for about twenty years (A.D. 477-*c.* 495).

Two copper-plate inscriptions discovered in the village of Dāmodarpur in the district of Dinājpur, testify to the fact that Budha Gupta's empire included Puṇḍravardhana *bhukti* (roughly North Bengal) which was governed by his viceroys (*Uparika Mahārāja*) Brahmadatta and Jayadatta.[2] The Sārnāth Inscription of A.D. 476-77 together with the Benares Stone Pillar Inscription of 159 (=A.D. 478-79 noted by Dr. D. C. Sircar (ASB, 6-12-48) (TRASB, 1949, 5 ff.) and Benares Inscription[3] of 479 prove his possession of the Kāśī country. In A.D. 484-85 the erection of a *dhvaja-stambha* or flag staff in honour of Janārdana, *i.e.*, Vishṇu, by the Mahārāja Mātṛivishṇu, ruler of Eraṇ, and his brother Dhanyavishṇu, while the *Bhūpati* (King) Budha Gupta, was reigning, and *Mahārāja* Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālindī (Jumna) and the Narmadā (Nerbudda), indicates that Budha Gupta's dominions included part of Central India as well as Kāśī and North Bengal.

The coins of this emperor are dated in the year A.D. *c.* 495. They continue the peacock-type of the Gupta silver coinage that was meant, according to Allan, for circulation in the central part of the empire.[4] Their

[1] Seal of Budha Gupta (*MASB*, No. 66, p. 64).

[2] To the reign of this Gupta king belongs also probably the Pāhāḍpur (ancient Somapura) (Rājshāhi District) plate of A.D. 478-79 (*Mod. Rev.*, 1931, 150; *Prabāsī* 1338, 671; *Ep. Ind.*, XX, 59 ff) and also a copper-plate of A.D. 488-9 (*Ep. Ind.*, xxiii. 52), originally found at Nandapura (Monghyr District). For a possible reference to Budha Gupta in Purāṇic literature, see *Pro. of the Seventh Or. Conf.*, 576.

[3] *JRASB*, 1949, 5 ff.

[4] *Cf.* also *Mahābhārata*, ii. 32. 4; Kālidāsa, *Meghadūta*, 1. 45.

legend is the claim to be lord of the earth and to have won heaven,—found on the coins of Kumāra Gupta I and Skanda Gupta.

SECTION V. SUCCESSORS OF BUDHA GUPTA

According to the *Life of Hiuen Tsang* Budha Gupta was succeeded by **Tathāgata** Gupta, after whom **Bālāditya** succeeded to the empire.[1] At this period the supremacy of the Guptas in Central India was challenged by the Hun king Toramāṇa. We have seen that in A.D. 484-85 a *Mahārāja* named Mātṛivishṇu ruled in the Airikiṇa *Vishaya* (Eraṇ in Eastern Mālwa, now in the Saugor District of the Central Provinces) as a vassal of the emperor Budha Gupta. But after his death his younger brother Dhanyavishṇu transferred his allegiance to Toramāṇa. The success of the Huns in Central India was, however, short-lived. In 510-11 we find a general named Goparāja fighting by the side of a Gupta king at Eraṇ and king Hastin of the neighbouring province of Ḍabhālā to the south-east of Eraṇ acknowledging the sovereignty of the Guptas. In A.D. 518-9 the suzerainty of the Guptas is acknowledged in the Tripurī *vishaya* (Jubbalpore District). In the year 528-29 the Gupta sway was still acknowledged by the *Parivrājaka-Mahārāja* of Ḍabhālā. The *Parivrājakas* Hastin and Saṁkshobha seem to have been the bulwarks of the Gupta Empire in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradeśa. The *Harsha-charita* of Bāṇa recognises the possession of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, by the Guptas as late as the time of Prabhākara-vardhana (*cir.* A.D. 600). There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Huns from parts of Central India was final.[2] The recovery of the Central Provinces was probably effected in the time of Bālāditya whose troops are repre-

[1] Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, II, p. 168; the *Life*, p. 111.

[2] For the survival of the Huns in the Mālwa region, See *Ep. Ind.*, xxiii., 102.

sented by Hiuen Tsang as having imprisoned Mihirakula, the son and successor of Toramāṇa, and set him at liberty at the request of the Queen Mother. The Hun king had to be content with a small kingdom in the north.[1] It is not improbable that Bālāditya was a *biruda* of the "glorious **Bhanu Gupta**, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Pārtha" along with whom Goparāja went to Eraṇ and having fought a "very famous battle" died shortly before A.D. 510-11.[2]

Mihirakula was finally subjugated by the *Janendra*[3] **Yaśodharman** of Mandaśor some time before A.D. 533.

[1] Beal *Si-yu-ki*, I, p. 171.

[2] In a Nālandā Stone Inscription (*Ep. Ind.*. XX, 43-45) Bālāditya is described as a king of irresistible valour and vanquisher of all foes. The last of the Bālādityas mentioned in a Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 285 f.) had a son named Prakaṭāditya by his wife Dhavalā. In the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* (ed. G. Śāstrī, p. 637 ff.) *Pakārākhya* (Prakaṭāditya) is represented as the son of *Bhakārākhya* (Bhānu Gupta). Buddhist tradition thus corroborates the identification, **first** proposed in these pages, of Bālāditya with Bhānu Gupta. *Cf. now* Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India*, pp. 47, 53. An inscription found at Guṇāighara near Comilla and certain seals at Nālandā disclose the existence of a king named (Vai)nya Gu(pta) who ruled in or about A.D. 507 and must have been also a contemporary of Mihirakula or of his father (*Prabāsī*, 1338, 675; IHQ, 1930, 53, 561). The seals give him the style *Mahārājādhirāja* (*ASI, AR*, 1930-34, Pt. I, 230, 249; *MASI*, 66, 67; *IHQ*, XIX, 275) and suggest relationship with the imperial Guptas Dr. D. C. Ganguly identifies him with the *Dvādaśāditya* of coins (IHQ, 1933, 784, 989). But owing to damaged condition of the Nālandā seal his parentage cannot be ascertained.

[3] The ascription of the title of Vikramāditya to Yaśodharman of Mandaśor, and the representation of this chief as a ruler of Ujjain, the father of Śīlāditya of Mo-la-po and the father-in-law of Prabhākara-vardhana are absolutely unwarranted. According to Father Heras (*JBORS*, 1927, March, 8-9) the defeat of Mihirakula at the hands of Bālāditya took place after the Hun king's conflict with Yaśodharman. It should, however, be remembered that at the time of the war with Bālāditya Mihirakula was a paramount sovereign to whom the king of Magadha had been tributary, and with whom he dared not fight, being only anxious to *conceal his poor person* (Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, Vol. I, p. 168). This is hardly possible after the *Janendra* of Mandaśor had compelled the Hun "to pay respect to his two feet". The victory of Bālāditya over Mihirakula was certainly not decisive. The "loss of the royal estate" was only temporary, and the tyrant soon placed himself on the throne of Kaśmīra and conquered Gandhāra (Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, I, p. 171). To the court-poet of Yaśodharman Mihirakula was pre-eminently a king of the Himālayan region. This is clear from the following passage which was misunderstood by Fleet whose interpretation has been followed by Father Heras (p. 8 n):—

"He (Yaśodharman) to whose feet respect was paid—by even that (famous)

Line 6 of the Mandaśor Stone Pillar Inscription[1] leaves the impression that in the time of Yaśodharman Mihirakula was the king of a Himālayan country ("small kingdom in the north"), *i.e.*, Kaśmīra and that neighbourhood, who was compelled "to pay respect to the two feet" of the victorious *Janendra* probably when the latter carried his arms to "the mountain of snow the tablelands of which are embraced by the Gaṅgā."

Yaśodharman claims to have extended his sway as far as the Lauhitya or Brahmaputra in the east. It is not improbable that he defeated and killed **Vajra** the son of Bālāditya,[2] and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍra-vardhana. Hiuen Tsang mentions a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra. The Dattas, who governed Puṇḍra-vardhana from the time of Kumāra Gupta I, disappear about this time. But Yaśodharman's success must have been short-lived, because in A.D. 543-44, ten years after the Mandaśor inscription which mentions the *Janendra* Yaśodharman as victorious, the son (?) and viceroy of a Gupta *paramabhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja pṛithivipati*, 'supreme sovereign, king of kings, lord of the earth', and not any official of the Central Indian *Janendra,* was governing the Puṇḍra-vardhana-*bhukti,* a province which lay between the Indian interior and the Lauhitya.

king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Sthānu (and) *embraced by whose arms the mountain of snow falsely prides itself as being styled an inaccessible fortress*" (Kielhorn in *Ind. Ant.*, 1885, p. 219). Kielhorn's interpretation was accepted by Fleet. [The statement that Mihirakula's head "had never been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Sthānu" shows that he refused to do homage to Bālāditya, and probably accounts for the order, given for his execution by that king.]

[1] CII, pp. 146-147; Jayaswal, *The Historical Position of Kalki*, p. 9.

[2] If the identification of Bālāditya with Bhānu Gupta first proposed in these pages is correct, his son Vajra may be identified with *Vakārākhya*, the younger brother (*anuja*) of the Prakaṭāditya of the Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, 284 ff.)—the *Pakārākhya* of the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa* who is represented as the son of *Bhakārākhya*, *i.e.*, Bhānu Gupta (ed. G. Śāstrī, pp. 637-44). Prakaṭāditya is represented in the inscription named above as the son of Bālāditya by Dhavalā. *Cf. now* Jayaswal, *An Imperial History of India*, pp. 47, 53, 56, 63.

THE EARLY IMPERIAL GUPTAS

Gupta
|
Ghaṭotkacha   Lichchhavis
|
Chandra Gupta I = Kumāra Devī
(?) A.D. 320
Samudra Gupta = Datta Devī
|
Dhruva Devī = Deva Gupta I (Chandra Gupta II) Vikramāditya = Kubera Nāgā
A.D. 376-413

Govinda Gupta Crown Prince ? | Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya A.D. 415-455 | (1) Devakī ? (2) Ananta Devī | Guttas of Guttal. | Prabhāvatī — Vākāṭaka kings of Bhojakaṭa, etc., in the Deccan

(children of Kumāra Gupta I:)
Skanda Gupta Vikramāditya II A.D. 455-c 467 | Puru Gupta = Śrī Chandra Devī (?) | ?Ghaṭotkacha Gupta, C. India

(children of Puru Gupta:)
Narasiṁha Gupta (Bālāditya) = Śrī Mitra Devī | Budha Gupta, A. D. 477-c. 495.

Kumāra Gupta II, Kramadityā, (?) A.D. 473-474
|
Vishṇu Gupta

(?) Tathāgata Gupta probably related to Vainya Gupta A.D. 507
⋮
Bālāditya II (Bhānu Gupta ?) A.D. 510
|
Prakaṭāditya (?) | Vajra (?)

SECTION VI. THE LINE OF KRISHNA GUPTA

The name of the Gupta emperor in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 543-44 is unfortunately lost. The Aphsaḍ Inscription, however, discloses the names of a number of "Gupta" kings,[1] the fourth of whom, Kumāra Gupta (III), was a contemporary of Īśānavarman Maukhari who is known from the Harāhā Inscription to have been ruling in A.D. 554.[2] Kumāra Gupta III, and his three predecessors, *viz.*, Kṛishṇa, Harsha and Jīvita, should probably be placed in the period between A.D. 510, the date of Bhānu Gupta, and 554, the date of Īśānavarman. It is possible, but by no means certain, that one of these kings is identical with the Gupta emperor mentioned in the Dāmodarpur plate of A.D. 543-44.[3] The absence of high-sounding titles like *Mahārājādhirāja* or *Parama-bhaṭṭāraka*

[1] Although the rulers, the names of most of whom ended in—*gupta*, mentioned in the Aphsaḍ and connected contemporary epigraphs, who ruled over the provinces in the heart of the early Gupta empire, are called "Guptas" for the sake of convenience, their relationship with the early *Gupta-kula* or *Gupta-vaṁśa* is not known. It is, however, to be noted that some of them (*e.g.*, Kumāra Gupta and Deva Gupta), bore names that are found in the earlier family, and Kṛishṇa Gupta, the founder of the line, has been identified by some with Govinda Gupta, son of Chandra Gupta II. But the last suggestion is hardly acceptable, because Govinda must have flourished more than half a century before Kṛishṇa Gupta. And it is surprising that the panegyrists of Kṛishṇa Gupta's descendants should have omitted all references to the early Guptas if their patrons could really lay claim to such an illustrious ancestry. In the Aphsaḍ inscription the dynasty is described simply as *Sad-vaṁśa* 'of good lineage'. The designation *Gupta*, albeit not *"Early Imperial Gupta"*, is possibly justified by the evidence of Bāṇa. The Guptas and the Gupta *Kulaputra* mentioned in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* and *Harsha-charita* may refer to the family of Kṛishṇa, if not to some hitherto unknown descendants of the early imperial line. One of the princes of the early Gupta line, Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of the Tumain inscription is known to have ruled over Eastern Mālwa and it is not impossible that Kṛishṇa Gupta was, in some way, connected with him. We must, however, await future discoveries to clear up the point.

[2] H. Śāstrī, *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 110 ff.

[3] Mr. Y. R. Gupte (*Ind. Hist. Journal*) reads the name of Kumāra in the inscription of A.D. 543-44. but he identifies him with the son of Narasiṁha Gupta. The ruler whose name is missing may represent one or other of the "Gupta" lines already known to scholars or some new line. *Cf.* the cases of Vainya Gupta and the princes mentioned on pp. 214-15 of *Ep. Ind.*, xx, Appendix.

in the *Ślokas* or verses of the Aphsaḍ Inscription does not necessarily prove that the kings mentioned there were petty chiefs. No such titles are attached to the name of Kumāra I in the Mandaśor Inscription, or to the name of Budha in the Eraṇ Inscription. On the other hand the queen of Mādhava Gupta, one of the least powerful kings mentioned in the Aphsaḍ Inscription, is called *Parama-bhaṭṭārikā* and *Mahādevī* in the Dēo Baraṇārk epigraph.

Regarding **Kṛishṇa Gupta** we know very little. The Aphsaḍ Inscription describes him as a hero whose arm played the part of a lion, in bruising the foreheads of the array of the rutting elephants of (his) haughty enemy (*dṛiptārāti*), (and) in being victorious by (its) prowess over countless foes. The *dṛiptārāti* against whom he had to fight may have been Yaśodharman. The next king **Deva Śrī Harsha Gupta** had to engage in terrible contests with those who were "averse to the abode of the goddess of fortune being with (him, her) own lord." There were wounds from many weapons on his chest. The name of the enemies, who tried to deprive him of his rightful possessions, are not given. Harsha's son **Jīvita Gupta I** probably succeeded in re-establishing the power of his family in the territory lying between the Himālayas and the sea, apparently in Eastern India. "The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on seaside shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow." The "haughty foes" on seaside shores were probably the Gauḍas who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time and who are described as living on the sea shore (*samudr-āśraya*) in the Harāhā Inscription of A.D. 554.[1] The other ene-

[1] Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 110 *et seq*

mies may have included ambitious *Kumārāmātyas* like Nandana of the Amauna plate.

The next king, **Kumāra Gupta III** had to encounter a sea of troubles. The Gauḍas were issuing from their "proper realm" which was in Western Bengal as it bordered on the sea and included Karṇasuvarṇa[1] and Rāḍhāpuri.[2] The lord of the Andhras who had thousands of three-fold rutting elephants, and the Śūlikas who had an army of countless galloping horses, were powers to be reckoned with. The Andhra king was probably Mādhavavarman (I, Janāśraya) of the Polamuru plates belonging to the Vishṇukuṇḍin family who "crossed the river Godāvari with the desire to conquer the eastern region"[3] and performed eleven horse-sacrifices. The Śūlikas were probably the Chalukyas.[4] In the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription the name appears as Chalikya. In the Gujarāṭ records we find the forms Solaki and Solaṅki. Śūlika may have been another dialectic variant. The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription tells us that in the sixth century A.D., Kīrtivarman I of the "Chalikya" dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vanga, Aṅga, Magadha, etc His father is known to have performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, "the super-eminent touch-stone to test the might of warriors conquering the world and an indication of the conquest of all the warriors." Prince Kīrtivarman may have been entrusted with the guardianship of the sacrificial steed that had to roam about for a year in the territories of the rulers to whom a challenge was thrown by the performer of the sacrifice.

A new power was rising in the Upper Ganges Valley

[1] M. Chakravarti, JASB, 1908, p. 274.

[2] *Prabodha-chandrodaya*, Act II.

[3] Dubreuil, AHD, p. 92 and D. C. Sircar, IHQ, 1933, 276 ff.

[4] In the *Bṛihat-Saṁhitā*, IX. 15; XIV. 8, the Śūlikas and Śaulikas are associated with Aparānta (N. Koṅkaṇ), Vanavāsī (Kanara) and Vidarbha (Berar). In *Bṛih. Saṁ.*, IX. 21, X. 7, XVI. 35, however, they are associated with Gandhāra and Vokkāṇa (Wakhan). A branch of the people may have dwelt in the north west. In JRAS, 1912, 128, we have a reference to Kulastambha of the Śulki family. Tāranātha (*Ind. Ant.*, IV, 364) places the kingdom of "Śulik" beyond "Togara" (Ter in the Deccan ?).

which was destined to engage in a death grapple with the Guptas for the mastery of Northern India. This was the Mukhara or **Maukhari**[1] power. The Maukharis claimed descent from the hundred sons whom king Aśvapati got from Vaivasvata, *i.e.*, Yama[2] (not Manu). The family consisted of several distinct groups. The stone inscriptions of one group have been discovered in the Jaunpur and Bārā Bankī districts of the Uttara Pradeśa, while lithic records of another group have been discovered in the Gayā district of Bihār. A third family has left inscription at Baḍvā in the Kotah state in Rājputāna. The Maukharis of Gayā, namely, Yajñavarman, Śārdūlavarman and Anantavarman were a feudatory family. Śārdūla is expressly called *sāmanta chūḍāmaṇi*, 'crest-jewel of vassal chiefs' in the Barābar Hill Cave Inscription of his son.[3] The Baḍvā Maukharis held the office of general or military governor under some Prince of Western India in the third century A.D. The Maukharis of the Uttara Pradeśa[4] probably also held a subordinate rank at first. The earliest princes of this family, *viz.*, Harivarman, Ādityavarman,

[1] The family was called both Mukhara and Maukhari. "*Soma-Sūrya vaṁśavīva Pushpabhūti* (sic) *Mukhara Vaṁśau*", "*sakalabhuvana namaskṛito Maukhari vaṁśaḥ.*" (*Harsha-charita*, Parab's ed., pp. 141,146). *Cf.* also CII, p. 229

[2] Mbh., III. 296. 38 ff. The reference is undoubtedly to the hundred sons that Aśvapati obtained as a boon from Yama on the intercession of his daughter Sāvitrī. It is surprising that some writers still identify the Vaivasvata of the Maukhari record with Manu.

[3] CII, p. 223. The connection of the Maukharis with Gayā is very old. This is proved by the clay seal with the inscription *Mokhaliśa*, or *Mokhaliṇam* (Fleet, CII, 14), to which attention has already been drawn above. A reference to the *Mokaris* seems also to occur in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of the Kadamba king Mayūraśarman (*Arch. Survey of Mysore*, A. R 1929, pp. 50 ff). Dr. Tripathi finds a possible reference in the *Mahābhāshya* (JBORS, 1934, March). For the Baḍvā ins., see *Ep. Ind.*, XXIII, 42 ff. (Altekar).

[4] In literature the Maukhari line of U. P. is associated with the city of Kanauj which may have been the capital at one time. *Cf.* C. V. Vaidya, *Mediaeval Hindu India*, I, pp. 9, 33; Aravamuthan, *the Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Samgam Age*, p. 101. Hiuen Tsang, however, declares Kanauj to have been included within the realm of the House of Pushyabhūti even before Harsha. A Gupta noble was in possession of Kuśasthala (Kanauj) for some time after the death of Rājyavardhana and before the rise of Harsha. (*Harsha-Charita*, Parab's ed., pp. 226, 249).

and Īśvaravarman, were simply *Mahārājas*. Ādityavarman's wife was Harsha Guptā, probably a sister of king Harsha Gupta. The wife of his son and successor Īśvaravarman was also probably a Gupta princess named Upa-Guptā. In the Harāhā inscription **Īśānavarman,** son of Īśvaravarman and Upa-Guptā,[1] claims victories over the **Andhras,**[2] the **Śūlikas** and the **Gauḍas** and is the first to assume the Imperial title of *Mahārājādhirāja*. It was this which probably brought him into conflict with king Kumāra Gupta III.[3] Thus began a duel between the Maukharis and the Guptas which ended only when the latter with the help of the Gauḍas wiped out the Maukhari power in the time of Grahavarman, brother-in-law of Harshavardhana.[4]

We have seen that Īśānavarman's mother and grandmother were probably Gupta princesses. The mother of Prabhākaravardhana, the other empire-builder of the second half of the sixth century, appears also to have been a Gupta princess. It seems that the Gupta marriages in this period were as efficacious in stimulating imperial ambition[5] as the Lichchhavi marriages of more ancient times.

Kumāra Gupta III claims to have "churned that formidable milk-ocean, the cause of the attainment of fortune, which was the army of the glorious Īśānavarman, a very moon among kings."[6] This is not an empty boast, for the Maukhari records do not claim any victory over

[1] Fleet, CII, 220.

[2] The victory over the Andhras is also alluded to in the Jaunpur stone inscription (CII. p. 230) which, according to Fleet, also seems to refer to a conflict with Dhārā, the capital of Western Mālava (?). Dr. Basāk thinks that Dhārā in this passage refers to the edge of the sword (*Hist. N. E. Ind.*, 109).

[3] Any one acquainted with the history of Europe knows that enumeration as I, II, III etc. need not imply that the kings in question belonged to the same dynasty.

[4] The successors of Grahavarman may have survived as petty nobles. With them a "Later Gupta" king contracted a matrimonial alliance in the seventh century A.D.

[5] *Cf.* Hoernle, JRAS, 1903, p. 557.

[6] Aphsaḍ Ins.

the Guptas. Kumār Gupta III's funeral rites took place at Prayāga which probably formed a part of his dominions.

The son and successor of this king was **Dāmodara Gupta.** He continued the struggle with the Maukharis[1] and fell fighting against them. "Breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the **Hūṇas** (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired[2] in the fight)."

Dāmodara Gupta was succeeded by his son **Mahāsena Gupta.** He is probably the king of Mālava, possibly Eastern Mālwa, mentioned in the *Harsha-charita*, whose sons Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta were appointed to wait upon Rājya-vardhana and Harsha-vardhana by their father, king Prabhākara-vardhana of the Pushyabhūti family of Śrīkaṇṭha (Thānesar). The intimate relation between the family of Mahāsena Gupta and that of Prabhākara-vardhana is proved by the Madhuban grant and the Sonpat copper seal inscription of Harsha which represent Mahāsena Guptā Devī as the mother of Prabhākara, and the Aphsaḍ inscription of Ādityasena which alludes to the association of Mādhava Gupta, son of Mahāsena Gupta, with **Harsha.**

[1] The Maukhari opponent of Dāmodara Gupta was either Sūryavarman or Sarvavarman (both being sons of Īśānavarman), if not Īśānavarman himself. A Sūryavarman is described in the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta as "born in the unblemished family of the Varmans, great on account of their *ādhipatya* (supremacy) over Magadha." If this Sūryavarman be identical with, or a descendant of, Sūryavarman, the son of Īśānavarman, then it is certain that for a time the supremacy of Magadha passed from the hands of the Guptas to that of the Maukharis. The Deo-Baraṇārk Inscription (Shāhābad District) of Jīvita Gupta II also suggests (CII, pp. 216-218) that the Maukharis Sarvavarman and Avantivarman held a considerable part of Magadha some time after Bālāditya-deva. After the loss of Magadha the later Guptas were apparently confined to "Mālava," till Mahāsena Gupta once more pushed his conquests as far as the Lauhitya.

[2] Reference to *Mahābhārata* XII. 98, 46-47; *Raghuvaṁś*, VII. 53; *Kāvyādarśa*, II, 119; *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, I. 68, shows that the objections raised against the interpretation of Fleet are invalid. The significance of the touch of *Surabadhūs* as distinct from a human being, is entirely missed by a writer in Bhand. Com. Vol 181, and a reviewer of Dr. Tripathi's *History of Ancient India.*

The Pushyabhūti alliance of Mahāsena Gupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukharis.[1] The policy was eminently successful, and during his reign we do not hear of any struggle with that family. But a new danger threatened from the east. A strong monarchy was at this time established in **Kāmarūpa** by a line of princes who claimed descent from Bhagadatta. King Susthitavarman[2] of this family came into conflict with Mahāsena Gupta and was defeated. "The mighty fame of Mahāsena Gupta," says the Aphsaḍ inscription, "marked with honour of victory in war over the illustrious Susthitavarman......is still constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya."

Between Mahāsena Gupta, the contemporary of Prabhākara-vardhana, and his younger or youngest son Mādhava Gupta, the contemporary of Harsha, we have to place a king named **Deva Gupta** II[3] who is mentioned by name in the Madhuban and Banskhera inscriptions of Harsha as the most prominent among the kings "who resembled wicked horses," who were all punished and restrained in their evil career by Rājya-vardhana. As the Gupta princes are uniformly connected with Mālava in the *Harsha-charita* there can be no doubt that the wicked Deva Gupta is identical with the wicked lord of Mālava who cut off Grahavarman Maukhari, and who was himself defeated "with ridiculous ease" by Rājya-vardhana.[4] It is difficult

[1] And perhaps of other aggressive states mentioned in the beginning of the fourth *Uchchhvāsa* of the *Harsha-charita*. The Lāṭas of that passage may have reference to the Kaṭachchuris who finally ousted the Guptas from Vidiśā in or about A.D. 608. The Kaṭachchuri (Kalachuri) dominions included the Lāṭa country in the latter part of the sixth and the first decade of the seventh century A.D. (Dubreuil, AHD, 82).

[2] See the Nidhanapur plates. A writer in the JRAS (1928) revives the theory that Susthitavarman was a Maukhari and not a king of Kāmarūpa. But no Maukhari king of that name is known. The association of Susthita varman with the river Lohitya or Brahmaputra clearly shows that the king of that name mentioned in the Nidhanapur plates is meant.

[3] The Emperor Chandra Gupta II was Deva Gupta I.

[4] It is difficult to believe, as does one writer, that the Mālava antagonist of Grahavarman and Rājya-vardhana was Buddharāja of the Kalachuri (Kaṭachchuri) family. Had that been the case then it is rather surprising that a shadowy figure like Devagupta, and not Buddha-rāja, would be specially

to determine the position of Deva Gupta in the dynastic list of the Guptas. He may have been the eldest son of Mahāsena Gupta, and an elder brother of Kumāra Gupta and Mādhava Gupta.[1] His name is omitted in the Aphsaḍ list of kings, just as the name of Skanda Gupta is omitted in the Bhitarī list.

Shortly before his death, king Prabhākara-vardhana had given his daughter Rājyaśrī in marriage to Grahavarman, the eldest son of the Maukhari king Avantivarman. The alliance of the Pushyabhūtis with the sworn enemies of his family must have alienated Deva Gupta, who formed a counter-alliance with the Gauḍas whose hostility towards the Maukharis dated from the reign of Īśānavarman. As soon as Prabhākara died the Gupta king and the Gauḍa king, Śaśāṅka,[2] seem to have made a joint attack on the Maukhari kingdom. "Graha-varman was by the wicked *rājā* of Mālava cut off from the living along with his noble deeds. Rājyaśrī also, the princess, was confined like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet and cast into prison at Kanyākubja." "The villain,

selected in the epigraphic records of the time of Harsha, for prominent notice among "the kings who resembled wicked horses," who received punishment at the hands of Rājyavardhana. It is the 'Guptas' who are associated with Mālava in the *Harsha-charita* which deals mainly with events till the rescue of Rājyaśrī. The rulers mentioned in connection with the tragic fate of the last of the Maukharis, the vicissitudes through which Rājyaśrī passed, and the struggles in which Rājyavardhana engaged, include Guptas and Gauḍas but no Kaṭachchuri king.

[1] Hoernle, JRAS, 1903, p. 562. The suggestion, however, cannot be regarded as a well-established fact. Devagupta may have represented a collateral line of the Mālava family who continued to pursue a policy hostile to the Pushyabhūtis and the Maukharis, while Kumāra, Mādhava, the Gupta *Kulaputra* who connived at the escape of Rājyaśrī from Kuśasthala (Kanauj), and Ādityasena, son of Mādhava, who gave his daughter in marriage to a Maukhari, may have belonged to a friendly branch.

[2] There is no reason to believe that Śaśāṅka belonged to the Gupta family (*pace* Allan, *Gupta Coins*, lxiv). Even if it be proved that he had a secondary name, Narendra Gupta, that by itself cannot establish a connection with the Gupta line in view of (*a*) the absence of any reference to his supposed Gupta ancestry in his own seal matrix ins. or in the record of his feudatories, (*b*) the use of the *Nandidhvaja* to the exclusion of the Garuḍadhvaja, (*c*) his Gauḍa connection. The epithet '*Samudrāśraya*' applied to the Gauḍas of the sixth century A.D., can hardly be regarded as an apposite characterisation of the Guptas of Magadha, Prayāga or Mālwa.

deeming the army leaderless purposes to invade and seize this country (Thānesar) as well."[1] Rājya-vardhana, though he routed the Mālava army "with ridiculous ease," was "allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the overlord of Gauḍa, and then weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters."

To meet the formidable league between the Guptas and the Gauḍas, Harsha, the successor of Rājya-vardhana, concluded an alliance with Bhāskara-varman, king of Kāmarūpa, whose father Susthita-varman Mṛigāṅka had fought against Mahāsena Gupta. This alliance was disastrous for the Gauḍas as we know from the Nidhanapur plates of Bhāskara. At the time of the issuing of the plates Bhāskara-varman was in possession of the city of Karṇasuvarṇa that had once been the capital of the Gauḍa king, Śaśāṅka, whose death took place some time between A.D. 619 and 637. The king overthrown by Bhāskara-varman may have been Jayanāga (*nāgarājasamāhvayo Gauḍarāja*, the king of Gauḍa named Nāga, successor of *Somākhya* or Śaśāṅka), whose name is disclosed by the Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription.[2] The Gauḍa people, however, did not tamely acquiesce in the loss of their independence. They became a thorn in the side of Kanauj and Kāmarūpa, and their hostility towards those two powers was inherited by the Pāla and Sēna successors of Śaśāṅka.

In or about A.D. 608 the Guptas seem to have lost Vidiśā to the Kaṭachchuris. Magadha was held a little before A.D. 637 by Pūrṇavarman. **Mādhava Gupta** the younger or youngest son of Mahāsena Gupta, remained a subordinate ally of Harsha of Thānesar and Kanauj and apparently resided at his court. In the period 618-27, Harsha "punished the kings of four parts of India" and in 641 assumed the title of King of Magadha.[3] After his

[1] *Harsha-charita, Uchchhvāsa* 6, p. 183.

[2] *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, pp. 60 ff; *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*, *ed.* G. Śāstrī, p 636. The name *Jaya* is also given in the Buddhist work.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, IX. 19.

death the Gupta sovereignty in Magadha was revived by **Ādityasena,** a prince of remarkable vigour and ability, who found his opportunity in the commotion which followed the usurpation of Harsha's throne by Arjuna (?). For this "Later Gupta" king we have a number of inscriptions which prove that he ruled over a wide territory extending to the shores of the oceans. The Aphsaḍ, Shāhpur and Mandāra inscriptions recognise his undisputed possession of south and part of east Bihār. A Deoghar inscription, noticed by Fleet,[1] describes him as the ruler of the whole earth up to the shores of the seas, and the performer of the *Aśvamedha* and the other great sacrifices. He renewed contact with the Gauḍas as well as the Maukharis and received a Gauḍa named Sūkshamśiva in his service. A Maukhari chief, Bhogavarman, accepted the hands of his daughter[2] and presumably became his subordinate ally. The Dēo-Baraṇārk inscription refers to the *Jayaskandhāvāra* of his great-grandson Jīvita Gupta II at Gomatīkoṭṭaka. This clearly suggests that the so-called Later Guptas, and not the Maukharis, dominated about this time the Gomatī valley in the *Madhya-deśa* The Mandāra inscription applies to Ādityasena the imperial titles of *Parama-bhaṭṭāraka* and *Mahārājādhirāja.* We learn from the Shāhpur stone image inscription that he was ruling in the year A.D. 672-73. It is not improbable that he or his son Deva Gupta (III) is the *Sakalottarā-patha-nātha*, lord of the whole of North India, who was defeated by the Chalukya kings Vinayāditya (A.D. 680-96) and Vijayāditya.[3]

We learn from the Dēo-Baraṇārk inscription that Ādityasena was succeeded by his son **Deva Gupta (III),** who in his turn was succeeded by his son **Vishṇu Gupta** (II).[4] The last king was **Jīvita Gupta II,** son of Vishṇu.

[1] CII, p. 213 n. Āditya is said to have performed three *Aśvamedha* sacrifices.

[2] Kielhorn, INI, 541.

[3] *Bom. Gaz.*, Vol. I, Part II, pp 189, 368, 371; and Kendur plates.

[4] This king seems also to be mentioned in an inscription discovered at Mangraon in the Buxar subdivision.

All these kings continued to assume imperial titles. That these were not empty forms appears from the records of the Western Chalukyas of Vātāpi which testify to the existence of a Pan-North Indian empire in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. The only North Indian sovereigns, *Uttarāpatha-nātha*, who laid claim to the imperial dignity during this period, and actually dominated Magadha and the *Madhya-deśa* as is proved by the Aphsaḍ and Dēo-Baraṇārk inscriptions, were Ādityasena and his successors.[1]

The Gupta empire was probably finally destroyed by the Gauḍas who could never forgive Mādhava Gupta's desertion of their cause and who may have grown powerful in the service of Ādityasena. In the time of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, *i.e.*, in the first half of the eighth century A.D., a Gauḍa king occupied the throne of Magadha.[2]

Petty Gupta Princes, apparently connected with the imperial line, ruled in the Kanarese districts during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries A.D. and are frequently mentioned in inscriptions. Evidence of an earlier connection of the Guptas with the Kanarese country is furnished by the Tālagund inscription which says that Kākustha-varman of the Kadamba dynasty gave his daughters in marriage to the Gupta and other kings. In

[1] For a curious reference to the Chalukyas and king Jih-kwan ('Sun army' *i.e.*, Ādityasena), see IA, X, p. 110.

[2] *Cf.* the *Gauḍavaho* by Vākpatirāja. Banerji confounds the Gauḍas with the later Guptas. In the Harāhā Inscription the Gaudas are associated with the sea coast, *Samudrāśraya*, while the later Guptas, as is well-known, had their centres in the hinterland including Magadha and Mālwa. The people on the seashore were, according to the evidence of the Aphsaḍ Inscription, hostile to Jīvita Gupta I. The *Praśastikāra* of the Aphsaḍ record is expressly mentioned as a Gauḍa, a designation that is never applied to his patrons. The family of Kṛishṇa Gupta is simply characterised as *Sadvaṁśa* and there is not the slightest hint that the kings of the line and their panegyrist belonged to the same nationality. The fact that Gauḍa is the designation of the lord of Magadha in the days of Yaśovarman early in the eighth century cannot be taken to prove that Gauḍa and later Gupta are interchangeable terms. In this period lordship of Magadha is not inseparably connected only with later Gupta lineage. *Cf.* the passage *Magadhāṭipatyamahatām jāta kule varmaṇām*, which proves the existence of non-Gupta lines among rulers of Magadha in this age.

the fifth or sixth century A.D. the Vākāṭaka king Narendrasena, a descendant of Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya through his daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā, is said to have married a princess of Kuntala, *i.e.*, of the Kanarese region.[1] Curiously enough, the Gutta or Gupta chiefs of the Kanarese country claimed descent from Chandra Gupta Vikramāditya,[2] lord of Ujjayinī.[3]

[1] Jouveau-Dubreuil, AHD, p. 76.

[2] *Bomb. Gaz.*, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 578-80 Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, "*A Peep into the Early History of India,*" p. 60. I owe this reference to Dr. Bhandarkar.

[3] The account of the Later Guptas was first published in the JASB, 1920, No. 7.

[1] A. Ghosh, *Two Maukhari seals from Nalanda*, Ep. xxiv, 285. We have reference to another son of Avantivarman named Suva or Such .. ... . who seems to have succeeded his father. Grahavarman too, has royal epithets in the *Harsha-charita* (pp. 149, 183). The order of succession is not, however clear from available evidence.

APPENDIX A

THE RESULTS OF AŚOKA'S PROPAGANDA IN WESTERN ASIA[1]

The vast region beyond the western frontiers of India came within the geographical horizon of Buddhist writers as early as the *Bāveru Jātaka*, and possibly the *Sussondi Jātaka*, and its princes figure not inconspicuously in Buddhist inscriptions of the third century B. C. The records of Aśoka show that the eyes of the imperial missionary of Magadha were turned more to the West than to the East; and even the traditional account of early Buddist proselytising efforts given in the chronicles of Ceylon,[2] does not omit to mention the country of the Yonas where Mahārakkhita "delivered in the midst of the people the '*Kālakārāma suttanta*,' in consequence of which a hundred and seventy thousand living beings attained to the reward of the path (of salvation) and ten thousand received the *pabbajjā*." It will perhaps be argued that the Yona country mentioned in the chronicles is to be identified with some district in the Kābul valley, and is not to be taken to refer to the realm of "Antiochos,[3] the Yona king, and the kings, the neighbours of that Antiochos, namely, Ptolemy, Antigonos, Magas and Alexander," mentioned in the second and the thirteenth rock edicts of Aśoka. Rhys Davids, in fact, is inclined to regard the declaration in these edicts about the success of Aśoka's missionary propaganda in the realms of Yona princes as mere "royal rhodomontade". "It is quite likely," says he, "that the Greek kings are only thrown in by way of make (weight, as it were); and that no emissaries had been actually sent there at all"[4] Sir Flinders Petrie is, however,

[1] Mainly an extract from an article published in the *Buddhistic Studies* (ed B. C. Law).

[2] *Mahāvaṁśa*, Ch XII.

[3] Dr Jarl Charpentier has contributed a paper to *A Volume of Indian Studies presented to Professor E J Rapson* in which he revives the suggestion of Prinsep (Hultzsch, Aśoka, xxxi) that "Amtiyaka" referred to by Aśoka is Antiochos Soter (c 281-61), and not his son Antiochos Theos (261 46). But his theory requires that Chandragupta ascended the throne in 327-25 B.C., that he was identical with Xandrames and that the story of his visit to Alexander (recorded by Justin and Plutarch) is a myth. The theory is opposed not only to the evidence of Justin and Plutarch, but to the known facts about the ancestry of Chandragupta. Unlike Xandrames, Chandragupta is nowhere represented as of barber origin. His paternal ancestors are described as rulers by Brāhmanical and Buddhist writers alike.

[4] *Buddhist India*, p. 298.

of opinion that in the Ptolemaic Period Buddhism and Buddhist festivals had already reached the shores of Egypt. He infers this from Indian figures found at Memphis. An epigraph from the Thebaid mentions as the dedicator "Sophon the Indian".[1]

Alberuni,[2] writing in the eleventh century A. D. says, "In former times Khurāsān, Persis, Irāk, Mosul, the country up to the frontier of Syria, was Buddhistic, but then Zarathustra went forth from Ādharbaijān and preached Magism in Balkh (Baktra). His doctrine came into favour with king Gushtasp, and his son Isfendiyād spread the new faith both in East and West, both by force and by treaties. He founded fire-temples through his whole Empire, from the frontiers of China to those of the Greek Empire. The succeeding kings made their religion (*i.e.*, Zoroastrianism) the obligatory state-religion for Persis and Irāk. In consequence the Buddhists were banished from those countries, and had to emigrate to the countries east of Balkh.........Then came Islam." The above account may not be correct in all its particulars. The statement that Buddhism flourished in the countries of Western Asia before Zoroaster is clearly wrong. But the prevalence of the religion of Śākyamuni in parts of Western Asia in a period considerably anterior to Alberuni and its suppression by Zoroastrianism and Islam may well be based upon fact. The antagonism of Buddhism to the fire-cult is hinted at in the *Bhūridatta Jātaka*.[3] It has even been suggested that Zoroastrian scriptures allude to disputes with the Buddhists.[4]

Four centuries before Alberuni, Hiuen Tsang bore witness to the fact that Lang kie(ka)-lo, a country subject to Persia, contained above 100 monasteries and more than 6,000 Brethren who applied themselves to the study of the Great and Little "Vehicles". Persia (Po-la-sse) itself contained two or three *Saṅghārāmas*, with several hundred priests, who principally studied the teaching of the Little Vehicle according to the Saravāstivādin school. The *pātra* of Śākya Buddha was in this country, in the King's palace.[5]

The Chinese pilgrim did not probably personally visit Persia. But no doubt need be entertained regarding the existence of Buddhist communities and *Saṅghārāmas* or monasteries in Irāṇ,

[1] Mahaffy, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 155f.

[2] Sachau, *Alberuni's India*, Vol. I, p. 21.

[3] No. 543.

[4] Sir Charles Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, III, 450.

[5] Beal, *Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, pp. 277-78; Watters *Yuan Chwang*, II, 257.

Stein discovered a Buddhist monastery in "the terminal marshes of the Helmund" in Seistān.[1] Mānī, the founder of the Manichæan religion, who was born in A.D. 215-16, at Ctesiphon in Babylonia and began to preach his gospel probably in A.D. 242, shows unmistakable traces of Buddhist influence.[2] In his book *Shābūrqān (Shapurakhan)* he speaks of the Buddha as a messenger of God. Legge and Eliot refer to a Manichæan treatise which has the form of a Buddhist Sūtra. It speaks of Mānī as the *Tathāgata* and mentions *Buddhas* and the *Bodhisattva*. In Bunyiu Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*, App., II, No. 4, we have reference to a Parthian prince who became a Buddhist *śramaṇa* or monk before A.D. 148. In his *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*,[3] Dr. Vincent Smith refers to a picture of a four-armed Buddhist saint or *Bodhisattva* in the guise of a Persian with black beard and whiskers, holding a thunderbolt *(vajra)* in his left hand, which has been found at a place called Dandān-Uiliq in Turkistan. Such figures are undoubtedly the products of a type of Buddhism which must have developed in Irāṇ, and enjoyed considerable popularity as late as the eighth century A.D. which is the date assigned by Dr. Smith to the fresco or distemper paintings on wood and plaster discovered at Dandān-Uiliq.

It is difficult to say to what extent Buddhist literature made its influence felt in Western Asia. Sir Charles Eliot points out the close resemblance between certain Manichæan works and the Buddhist *Suttas* and the *Pātimokkha*, and says that according to Cyril of Jerusalem, the Manichæan scriptures were written by one Scythianus and revised by his disciple Terebinthus who changed his name to Boddas.[4] He finds in this "jumble" allusions to Buddha Śākyamuni and the Bo-tree. It may further be pointed out that some *Jātaka* tales show a surprising similarity to some of the stories in the *Arabian Nights*. The *Samugga Jātaka*,[5] for instance, tells the story of the demon who put his beautiful wife in a box and guarded her in this manner in order that she might not go astray.

[1] Sir Charles Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, III, 3.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 446, *The Dacca University Journal*, Feb., 1926, pp. 108, 111, JRAS, 1913, 69, 76, 81.

[3] P. 310.

[4] *Cf.* McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, p. 185. "Terebinthus proclaimed himself learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians and gave out that his name was no longer Terebinthus but that he was a new Buddha (Buddas) and that he was born of a virgin. Terebinthus was the disciple of Scythianus, who was a Saracen born in Palestine and who traded with India."

[5] No. 436.

But this did not prevent her from taking pleasure with others. The tale in all its essential recurs in the *Arabian Nights.*[1]

The *Jātaka* verse,

> *"He his true bliss in solitude will find,*
> *Afar from woman and her treachery"*

is comparable to the statement of the poet in the *Arabian Nights* :

> *"Never trust in women ; nor rely upon their vows ;*
> *For their pleasure and displeasure depend upon their passions.*
> *They offer a false affection ;*
> *For perfidy lurks within their clothing."*

Whatever may be the case at the present day, in times gone by Western Asia was clearly not altogether outside the sphere of the intellectual and spiritual conquests of Buddhism.

[1] Burton, *The Book of the Thousand Nights*, I. 12ff; Olcott, *Stories from the Arabian Nights*, p. 3; Lane's *Arabian Nights*, pp. 8-9. A similar story is found in *Lambaka X*, *taraṅga* 8 of the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*; Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, Vol. V. pp. 151-52. "So attachment to women, the result of infatuation produces misery to all men. But indifference to them produces in the discerning emancipation from the bonds of existence."

APPENDIX B

A Note on the Chronological Relation of Kanishka and Rudradāman I[1]

Some years ago[2] Mr. Haricharan Ghosh and Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar contributed two very interesting notes on the date of Kanishka. The latter upholds the theory of Dr. Sten Konow, fortified by the calculations of Dr. Van Wijk, that the great Kushān Emperor began his rule in A.D. 128-29, and criticises the view put forward in this work that Kanishka I's rule in the "Lower Indus Valley" (this and not "Sind," is the expression actually used) could not have synchronised with that of Rudradāman I, who, "did not owe his position as *Mahākshatrapa* to anybody else." The conclusions of Professor Konow and Dr. Van Wijk are admittedly hypothetical, and little more need be said about them after the illuminating observations of Professor Rapson in *JRAS*, 1930, January, pp. 186-202. In the present note we shall confine ouselves to an examination of the criticism of Professor Jayachandra Vidyalankar and Mr. Haricharan Ghosh of the views expressed in the preceding pages.

The Professor has not a word to say about the contention that Kanishka's dates 1-23, Vāsishka's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 31[3]-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 67-98 suggest a continuous reckoning In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era current in North-West India which commenced in the second century A.D. He only takes considerable pains to prove that Rudradāman's sway over Sindhu-Sauvīra (which he identifies with modern Sind) between 130 and 150 A.D. does not imply control over Sui Vihār and Multān, and consequently Kanishka's sovereignty over Sui Vihār in the year 11 of an era starting from 128-29 A.D., *i.e.*, in or about 140 A.D., is not irreconcilable with the rule of the Great Satrap in Sindhu-Sauvīra at about the same time. He is not oblivious of the difficulty of harmonising this limitation of Rudradāman's power with the known fact of the Great Satrap's campaign against the Yaudheyas in the course of which he claims to have uprooted that powerful tribe "in their country

[1] *IHQ*, March, 1930, pp. 149ff.

[2] *IHQ*, V, No. 1, March, 1929, pp. 49-80, and *JBORS*, XV, parts I & II March-June, 1929, pp. 47-63.

[3] The earliest recorded date of Huvishka is now known to be the year 28

proper which was to the north of Suē Vihār" and, according to, the theory advocated by the Professor, "formed part of Kanishka's dominions" at that time. He meets the difficulty by saying that "the pressure of the Kausāna armies from the North had driven the Yaudheyas to the desert of Marwar". Such surmises to explain away inconvenient details, are, to say the least, not convincing, especially in view of the fact that Maru finds separate mention in the inscription of Rudradāman as a territory under the rule of the mighty Satrap.

But is the contention of the Professor that Sindhu-Sauvīra did not include the country up to Multān correct ? Alberuni, who based his assertions on the geographical data of the *Purāṇas* and the *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, made the clear statement that Sauvīra was equivalent to Multān and Jahrāvār.[1] Against this Professor Vidyalankar quotes the evidence of Yuan Chwang who says that in his days "Mou-lo-san-pu-lu," *i.e.*, Mūla-sthāna-pura or Multān was a dependency of the "Che-ka" or Takka country in the C. Pañjāb. It should be noted, however, that the Chinese pilgrim is referring to political dependence, and not geographical inclusion. India was a dependency of Great Britain. But geographically it was not a part of the British Isles. On the other hand, Alberuni does not give the slightest hint that what he actually means by the equation "Sauvīra, *i.e.*, Multān and Jahrāvār" is political subjection of Multān to Sind. His account here is purely geographical, and he is merely giving the names of the countries, as taken from the *Saṁhitā* of Varāhamihira with his own comments. Far from making Multān a political dependency of Sind he carefully distinguishes "Sauvīra, *i.e.*, Multān and Jahrāvār" from "Sindhu" which is mentioned separately.

The view that ancient Sauvīra was confined to Southern Sind and that Sindhu and Sauvīra together correspond to modern Sind, and nothing but Sind, is unsupported by any early evidence. Yuan Chwang went east from Sin-tu above 900 li and, crossing to the east bank of the Indus, came to the Mou-lo-san-pu-lu country.[2] This proves that Sin-tu lay to the *west* of Mou-lo-san-pu-lu (Multān), and was situated on the *west* side of the Indus. The commentator of the *Kāmasūtras* of Vātsyāyana makes the clear statement[3] सैन्धवानामिति । सिन्धुनामा नदस्तस्य पश्चिमेन सिन्धुदेशास्तत्र भवानाम् । The major part of modern Sind was clearly outside the geographical (as opposed to the political) limits of ancient "Sin-tu" or

[1] I. 302.
[2] Watters, II. 254.
[3] Benares edition, p. 295.

Sindhu and was, in the days of Yuan Chwang, included in the countries of A-tien-p'o-chih-lo, Pi-to-shih-lo, and A-fan-tu. Part of the modern territory of Sind may have been included in Sauvīra whose southern limits undoubtedly reached the sea, because the *Milinda-Pañho* mentions it in a list of countries where "ships do congregate". We are informed by the author of the *Periplus* that "ships lie at anchor at Barbaricum" (at the mouth of the Indus). But the evidence of Alberuni leaves no room for doubt that the northern limits of Sauvīra reached Multān. A scholar like Alberuni thoroughly conversant with Purāṇic lore, is not likely to make an unwarranted statement. In fact, the inclusion of Multān within Sauvīra receives striking confirmation from some of the *Purāṇas*. The *Skandapurāṇa*, for instance,[1] referring to the famous temple of the Sun at Mūla-sthāna or Multān, says that stood on the banks of the river Devikā (*Devikātaṭa*):—

> ततो गच्छेन्महादेवि मूलस्थानमिति श्रुतम् ।
> देविकायास्तटे रम्ये भास्करं वारितस्करम् ॥

In the Agnipurāṇa[2] the Devikā is brought into special relations with the realm of Sauvīra:—

> सौवीरराजस्य पुरा मैत्रेयोऽभूत् पुरोहितः ।
> तेन चायतनं विष्णोः कारितं देविकातटे ॥

According to Yuan Chwang, Sin-tu and Multān were neighbouring countries lying on opposite sides of the Indus. This is quite in accordance with the close association of Sindhu and Sauvīra in early literature.

> पतिः सौवीरसिन्धूनां दुष्टभावो जयद्रथः ।[3]
> कश्चिदेकः शिबीनाढ्यान् सौवीरान् सह सिन्धुभिः ।[4]
> शिबिसौवीरसिन्धूनां विषादश्चाप्यजायत ।[5]

Rudradāman's mastery over Sindhu and Sauvīra (in the sense in which these terms were understood by the *Purāṇas*, the commentator on the *Kāmasūtras* of Vātsyāyana, Yuan Chwang and Alberuni) is clearly irreconcilable with the simultaneous sovereignty of Kanishka over Sui Vihār.

Apart from the identification of Sauvīra with Multān and Jahrāvār, is it unreasonable to hold that a power which exercised sway over ancient Sindhu and Maru, and fought with the Yaudheyas of Johiyawār, had the Sui Vihār region under its control?

Mr. H. C. Ghosh asserts[6] that it cannot be proved that Ru-

[1] *Prabhāsa-kshetra-Māhātmya*, Ch. 278.
[2] Ch. 200.
[3] Mbh., III, Ch. 266.
[4] Mbh., III, Ch. 266.
[5] Mbh., III, Ch. 270.
[6] *IHQ*, 1929, p. 79.

dradāman held Sindhu and Sauvīra some time from 136 A.D. at least. He also thinks that the argument that Kanishka started an era "involves a *petitio principii*." Now, we know that by 150 A.D. Rudradāman was "the lord of the whole of eastern and western Ākarāvanti, Anupanīvṛid, Ānartta, Surāshṭra, Svabhra, Maru, Kachchha, Sindhu, Sauvīra, Kukura, Aparānta, Nishāda, and other territories gained by his own valour." The conquest of so many countries must have taken a long time, and the Andhau inscriptions show that one of the countries, at any rate, namely, Kachchha, had come under the sway of the Great Satrap as early as 130 A.D. On p. 277 of the *Political History of Ancient India* (second edition) it has been pointed out that "the name of the capital of Scythia (*i.e.*, the Lower Indus Valley) in the time of the periplus was Minnagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Śakasthāna mentioned by Isidore. Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the name of the western *Kshatrapas* of Cashṭana's line, *viz.*, 'Dāman' (-dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārddamaka family, from which the daughter of the *Mahākshatrapa* Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Karddama river in Persia."

The facts noted above indicate that the Śaka sept to which Chashṭana and Rudradāman belonged came from Śakasthāna in Irān through the Lower Indus Valley to Cutch and other places in Western India. In view of this and the contiguity of Cutch to the Lower Indus Valley, it is permissible to think that the date of the conquest of Sindhu and Sauvīra could not have been far removed from, and may have even preceded, that of Cutch (Kachchha). As the great Satrap retained his hold on these provinces till 150 A.D. it stands to reason that he was their ruler from *c.* 136 A.D.

As to the second contention of Mr. Ghosh, it may be pointed out that Kanishka's dates 1-23, Vāsishka's dates 24-28, Huvishka's dates 28-60, and Vāsudeva's dates 67-98, do suggest a continuous reckoning. To deny that Kanishka started an era is tantamount to saying that the dates of its successors, Vāsishka, Huvishka, and Vāsudeva are regnal years. But no serious student will contend that Vāsudeva's dates 67-98 are to be taken as regnal years.

APPENDIX C

A NOTE ON THE LATER GUPTAS[1]

It was recently urged by Professor R. D. Banerji that Mahāsena Gupta of the Aphsaḍ inscription, father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, could not have been a king of East Mālava, and secondly, that Susthitavarman whose defeat at the hands of Mahāsena Gupta, in the Lohita or Lauhitya region, is mentioned in the Aphsaḍ inscription, was not a Maukhari, but a king of Kāmarūpa.

The second proposition will be readily accepted by all careful students of the Aphsaḍ epigraph and the Nidhanapur plate inscription, though some western scholars are still, I know not why, of a contrary opinion.[2] As to the first point, *viz.*, whether Mahāsena Gupta was a direct ruler of East Mālava or of Magadha, a student will have to take note of the following facts:—

(*i*) In the Dêô-Baraṇārk Inscription of Jīvita Gupta II, which records the continuance of the grant of a village[3] in south Bihar, we have reference to Bālāditya-deva, and after him, to the Maukharis Śarvavarman and Avantivarman. Not a word is said about their later Gupta contemporaries in connection with the previous grants of the village. The inscription is no doubt damaged, but the sovereignty of Śarvavarman and Avantivarman undoubtedly precludes the possibility of the direct rule of their contemporaries of the later Gupta line.

(*ii*) Inscriptions discovered in the Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill caves disclose the existence of another line of Maukhari "Varmans" who were feudatory (*sāmanta*) chiefs of the Gayā district in the time of the later Guptas.

(*iii*) Yuan Chwang who visited Magadha in the time of Harsha mentions Pūrṇavarman as the occupant of the throne of

[1] Mainly an extract from an article published in *JBORS*, Sept.-Dec., 1929, pp. 561ff.

[2] *JRAS*, 1928, July, pp. 689f.

[3] Dr. R. C. Majumdar's suggestion that the village in question may have been situated in U.P. has been commented upon by Dr. Sircar who points out that Fleet's reading of the name of the village (on which Dr. Majumdar bases his conclusions) is tentative and unacceptable.

Magadha.[1] He does not say a word about Mādhava Gupta or his father in connection with Magadha.

(*iv*) Bāṇa indeed, refers to Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, but he expressly mentions his father as the king of Mālava, and not of Magadha. The existence of two associates of Harsha, each bearing the name of Mādhava Gupta, one of whom was the son of a king of Magadha, is not known to the biographer of the great emperor.

From the evidence adduced above two facts emerge, *viz.*, that the father of the only Mādhava Gupta whom the biographer of Harsha knew to be the associate of his royal patron, was a king of Mālava, and that before Harsha's conquest of the province in A.D. 641,[2] direct control over Magadha was exercised, not by the Guptas, but by the "Varmans". The memory of "Varman" *ādhipatya* (supremacy) over Magadha had not died away even in the time of the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśiva Gupta.

The only relevant argument that Professor Banerji urged against the view that Mahāsena Gupta, the father of Mādhava Gupta, the associate of Harsha, was "*probably*"[3] a king of Mālava, is that "it was impossible for a king of Mālava to reach the banks of the Lauhitya without strenuous opposition from the kings" who governed the intervening region. But how did Professor Banerji solve the problem? By making Mahāsena Gupta king of Magadha, and *assuming* that "Assam very probably lay on his frontier and Rādhā and Vanga or Mithilā and Varendra were included in his kingdom." Anything in the nature of a proof he failed to give, but we were asked to accept his surmise because "in this case only is it possible for Mahāsena Gupta to have fought with Susthitavarman of Assam."

Regarding the possibility of a king of Mālava carrying his arms to the banks of the Lauhitya, attention may be invited to the Mandaśor inscription of Yaśodharman. In the case of Mahāsena Gupta a careful student of the Aphsaḍ inscription cannot fail to note that the way before him had been prepared by his immediate predecessors. Kumāra Gupta, his grandfather, had pushed to Prayāga, while Dāmodara Gupta, father of Mahāsena Gupta, claims to have "broken up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari"—the same power which we have already seen, held control of Magadha a little before Harsha's conquest of the Province. The Gauḍa expansion had

[1] Watters, III, 115.
[2] *Ind. Ant.*, IX, 19.
[3] *Political History of Ancient India, Second Edition*, p. 373.

already been stopped for a time by the victories of Īśānavarman Maukhari. What was there to prevent the son of Dāmodara Gupta (who must have assumed command after the *death* of his father on the battle-field)[1] from pushing on the Lauhitya?

[1] *Cf.* Fleet *Corpus III*, pp 203, 206. *Cf.* also *Vīraśayyā motif ante*. 606 n 1.

APPENDIX D

THE DECLINE OF THE EARLY GUPTA EMPIRE[1]

Towards the close of the fifth century A.D. the empire built up by the genius of Samudra Gupta and Vikramāditya was fast hastening towards dissolution. Skanda Gupta (A.D. 455-c.467) was the last king of the Early Gupta line who is known to have controlled the westernmost provinces. After A.D. 467 there is no evidence that the Imperial Guptas had anything to do with Surāshṭra or the major part of Western Mālwa.[2] Budha Gupta (A.D. 476-77 to c. 495) was probably the last prince of the family to be implicitly obeyed on the banks of the Lower Ganges as well as the Narmadā. The rulers who came after him retained a precarious hold for some time on Eastern Mālwa and North Bengal. But they had to fight with enemies on all sides, and, if a tradition recorded by Jinasena,[3] is to be believed, their power collapsed in A.D. 551 (320+231):

Guptānāṁ cha śata-dvayam
eka-triṁśachcha varshāṇi
kāla-vidbhir udāhṛitam.[4]

[1] First published in the *Calcutta Review*, April, 1930.

[2] The identity of the supreme lord (*Parama-svāmin*) mentioned in connection with the consecration of the early Valabhī king Droṇasiṁha, is unknown. The surmise that he was a Gupta, though plausible lacks convincing proof. Some scholars lay stress on the fact that the era used is the Gupta era (IC, V. 409). But the use of an era instituted by a dynasty does not *always* indicate *political* subordination to that line. It may simply have a geographical significance, a continuation of a custom prevailing in a particular locality. Even undoubted Gupta vassals used the *Mālava-Vikrama Samvat* in Mandasor. Conversely the Gupta era is found used in regions, *e.g.*, Shorkot and Ganjam, beyond the proper limits of the Gupta empire. Tejpur, too, should possibly come under the category, as we are not sure as to whether it formed a part of the state of Kāmarūpa in the fourth century A.D. Equally conjectural is the identification of the ruler in question with a Hun or a sovereign of Mandasor. Theories and speculations in the absence of clear data are at best unprofitable. Some connection of the later kings of the Gupta line with the Mandasor region in W. Mālwa in the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. may possibly be hinted at by the expression *Guptanāthaiḥ* 'by the Gupta lords' used in the Mandasor *praśasti* or panegyric of Yaśodharman. The term *nātha* may have reference to the fact that the Guptas were once overlords of Mandasor. But the analogy of *Hūṇādhipa* occurring in the same record may suggest that *nātha* simply means 'lord' or 'king' without reference to any special relations subsisting between Mandasor and the Guptas in or about 533 A.D.

[3] *Harivaṁśa*, Ch. 60.

[4] Ind. Ant., 1886, 142; *Bhand Com.*, Vol., 195.

The supremacy over Āryāvarta then passed to the houses of Mukhara (*cir.* A.D. 554)[1] and Pushyabhūti (family of Harsha, A.D. 606-47) under whom the centre of political gravity shifted from Magadha to Kanauj and that neighbourhood. Attempts were no doubt made by a line of so-called later Guptas to restore the fallen fortunes of their family, but these were not crowned with success till after the death of Harsha.

The causes of the decline of the early Gupta Empire are not far to seek, though a detailed presentation of facts is impossible in view of the paucity of contemporary records. The broad outline of the story is, however, perfectly clear The same causes were at work which proved so disastrous to the Turki Sultanate of Delhi in the fourteenth century, and to the so-called Mughul Empire in the eighteenth, *viz.*, outbreak of rebellions within, devastating invasions from without, the growth of a class of hereditary governors and other officials who commanded enormous influence in local centres, and assumed the titles of *Mahārāja* and *Mahārājādhirāja*, and dissensions in the imperial family itself.

Already in the time of Kumāra Gupta I, the stability of the empire was seriously threatened by a turbulent people whose name is commonly read as **Pushya-mitra**. The danger was averted by the crown prince Skanda Gupta. But a more formidable enemy appeared from the steppes of Central Asia Inscriptions discovered at Bhitarī, Kura, Gwalior and Eran, as well as the records of several Chinese pilgrims, prove that shortly after the death of Kumāra Gupta I, the fierce **Huns** swooped down upon the north-western provinces of the empire and eventually made themselves masters of the Pañjāb and Eastern Mālwa.

The newcomers were long known to the people of India as a race of Uitlanders closely associated with the Chinese. The *Mahāvastu*[2] mentions them along with the Chīnas, while the *Sabhāparva* of the *Mahābhārata*[3] includes them in a list of foreign tribes amongst whom the Chīnas occupy the first place:—

Chīnān Śakaṁs tathā ch Odrān(?)[4] *Varvarān Vanavāsinaḥ*
Vārshneyān (?) Hāra-Hūnāṁścha Krishnān Haimavatāṁstathā.

[1] *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 110-20, *JRAS*, 1906, 843f. About this time (A.D. 554 or A.D. 564) as pointed out by Drs. Bhattasali and Sircar, king Bhūtivarman of Assam is found arrogating to himself imperial titles by the performance of an *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. *Cf Bhāratavarsha*, Āshādha, 1348. p. 83, etc. *Ep* Ind., xxvii. 18f. Subsequently Sircar opines that he finds no Gupta year in the record.

[2] I. 135.

[3] II. 51, 23-24.

[4] The mention of the Odras in this connection is odd. It is tempting to read in the epic verse Chaḍotāmcha (instead of *tathāchodrān*). Chaḍota is the name of a territory in Central Asia near Khotan.

A verse in the *Bhīshmaparva*[4] brings the Huns into relations with the Pārasikas or Persians :—

Yavanās Chīna-Kāmbojā dāruṇā Mlechchhajātayaḥ
Sakṛidgrahāḥ Kulatthāścha Hūṇāḥ Pārasikaiḥ saha.

This verse is reminiscent of the period when the Huns came into contact with the Sassanian dynasty of Persia.[5] Kālidāsa, too, places the Huns close to Persia—in the saffron-producing country watered by the river Vaṅkshu, the modern Oxus.[6] Early in the reign of the Emperor Skanda Gupta they poured into the Gupta Empire, but were at first beaten back. The repulse of the Huns is mentioned in the Bhitarī Inscription and is also probably alluded to by the grammarian Chandragomin as a contemporary even[7] With the passing away of Skanda Gupta, however, all impediments to the steady advance of the invaders seem to have been removed and, if Somadeva, a Jaina contemporary of Kṛishṇa III, Rāshṭrakūṭa, is to be believed, they penetrated into Indian interior as far as Chitrakūṭa.[1] They certainly conquered the Eraṇ district (*Airikiṇa pradeśa*) in the northern part of the present Madhya Pradeśa. The principal centres of their power in India, in the time of their kings Toramāṇa and Mihirakula, were Pavvaiya on the Chināb[2] and Śākala, modern Siālkoṭ, between the Chenāb and the Degh, in the Upper Pañjāb.

Next to the Hun inroads must be mentioned the ambition of generals and feudatories. In the time of the Emperor Skanda Gupta, Surāshtra was governed by a *Goptṛi* or Margrave named Parṇadatta, who was appointed by the emperor himself to the Viceroyalty of the Far West. Shortly afterwards, Bhaṭārka, a chief of the **Maitraka** clan, established himself in this province as general or military governor, with his capital probably at Valabhī. He, as well as his immediate successor, Dharasena I, was satisfied with the title of *Senāpati* or general, but the next chief Droṇasiṁha, the second son of Bhaṭārka (A.D. 502-03) had to be installed as *Mahārāja* by his suzerain. A branch of the dynasty established itself in Mo-la-po

[4] 9.65-66.

[5] Smith. *EHI*. 4th edition, p. 339. See also W.M. McGovern, *The Early Empires of Central Asia.*

[6] *Ind. Ant.*, 1912, 265f.

[7] *Ind. Ant.*, 1896, 105.

[1] *Bhand., Com. Vol.*, 216. Chitrakūṭa may be Chitor in Rājaputāna, or more probably the equally famous Chitrakūṭa on the Mandākinī in Central India, where Rama lived for a short time during his banishment. A Hūna-maṇḍala is mentioned in an inscription as being situated in the Mālwa region (*Ep. Ind.* XXIII. 102).

[2] JBORS. 1928, March. p. 33; C. J. Shah, *Jainism in Northern India*, 210, quoting *Kuvalayamālā* (? 8th century A.D.).

(Mālavaka)[3] or the westernmost part of Mālwa in the latter half of the sixth century, and made extensive conquests in the direction of the Sahya and Vindhya Hills.[4] Another, and a junior, branch continued to rule at Valabhī. In the seventh century Dhruvasena II of Valabhī married the daughter of Harsha. His son Dharasena IV (A.D. 645-49) assumed the imperial titles of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka Parameśvara Chakravartin*.

But the Maitrakas of Mo-la-po and Valabhī were not the only feudatories who gradually assumed an independent position. The rulers of Mandaśor pursued the same course, and their example was followed by the Maukharis of the Madhyadeśa and the kings of Navyāvakāśikā-Vardhamāna and Karnasuvarna in Bengal.

Mandaśor, the ancient **Daśapura** was one of the most important Viceregal seats of the Early Gupta Empire. It was the Capital of a long line of margraves belonging to the Aulikara family[1] who governed part of Western Malwa on behalf of the Emperor Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya and his son Kumāra Gupta I Mahendāditya. With the sixth century A.D. however, a new scene opened. Yaśodharman, ruler of Mandaśor about A.D. 533, emboldened no doubt by his success over the Huns, defied the power of the Gupta lords (*Guptanātha*), and set up pillars of victory commemorating his conquests, which, in the words of his court panegyrist, embraced the whole of Hindusthān from the river Lauhitya, or the Brahmaputra, to the Western Ocean, and from the Himālayas to the mountain Mahendra or the Eastern Ghāts. After his death the Guptas figure

[3] Smith. EHI, 4th edition, p. 343.

[4] Dharasena II, king of Valabhī, left two sons, *viz.*, Śilāditya II Dharmāditya and Kharagraha I. The account of Hiuen Tsang seems to suggest that in his time (*i.e.*, shortly after Śīlāditya) the Maitraka dominions split up into two parts, one part including Mo-la-po and its dependencies probably obeying the line of Śīlāditya-Dharmāditya, the other part, including Valabhī, obeying Kharagraha and his sons, one of whom was Dhruvasena II, Bālāditya or Dhruvabhata, who married the daughter of Harsha of Kanauj. The account of the Chinese pilgrim seems to receive confirmation from the Alina plate of Śīlāditya VII (Fleet, CII, 171f. esp. 182n) which associates Derabhaṭa, the son of Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya, with the region of the Sahya and Vindhya mountains, while the descendants of Kharagraha I are connected with Valabhī. The Navalakhi and Nogāwā plates, however, suggest that occasionally the same ruler governed both Mālavaka and Valabhī. In the latter half of the seventh century A.D. the line of Kharagraha I became extinct, and the Maitraka dominions were once more united. For an alleged connection of the Valabhī dynasty with the Kanarese country, see Moraes, *Kadamba-kula*, 64f. The recently discovered Virdi copperplate grant of Kharagraha I of the year 297 (=A.D. 616-17) shows that for a time that ruler held Ujjain (*Pro of the 7th Or. Conf.* 659ff.). It is from the camp at Ujjain that the grant was issued.

[1] *Ep. Ind.* XXVI. 130 ff; Fleet, *CII*, 153.

again as lords of Mālava (Eastern Mālwa) in literature and possibly in inscriptions of the time of Harsha. But Western Mālwa could not be recovered by the family. Part of it was, as we have already seen, included within the dominions of the Maitrakas. Another part, *viz.*, Avanti or the district round Ujjain, the proud capital of Vikramāditya and Mahendrāditya in the fifth century A.D.,[2] is found in the next centuries in the possession of Śaṁkaragana of the Kaṭachchhuri or Kalachuri dynasty[1] and Kharagraha I of the Maitraka line which gave way to a Brāhmaṇa family in the days of Hiuen Tsang,[2] which in its turn, was replaced by the Rāshtrakūtas, the Gurjara Pratihāras and other families.[3]

Another family which came to the forefront in the sixth century A.D., was the line of the Mukharas or **Maukharis** The stone inscriptions of the princes of this dynasty prove their control over the Bārā Bankī, Jaunpur and Gayā districts of the Uttar Pradeśa and Bihār. All these territories formed integral parts of the Gupta Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. In the next century they must have passed into the hands of the Maukharis The feudatory titles of the earlier princes of the Mukhara line leave no room for doubt that they occupied a subordinate position in the first few decades of the sixth century A.D. In or about the year A.D. 554, however, Iśānavarman Maukhari ventured to measure swords with the Guptas, and probably also with Huns, and assumed the Imperial title of *Mahārājādhirāja*. For a period of about a quarter of a century (A.D. 554-*cir*. A.D. 580) the Maukharis were beyond

[2] Somadeva. *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, Bk. XVIII; Allan. *Gupta Coins*, xlix n; *Bomb. Gaz.*, I. ii. 578.

[1] G. Jouveau Dubreuil, *Ancient History of the Deccan*, 82.

[2] Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, ii. 250. This family may have been connected with the viceregal line of Naigamas mentioned in the Mandaśor Inscription of the Mālava year 589, of the time of Yaśodharman and Vishnuvardhana. Abhayadatta of this family was the viceroy (*Rājasthānīya, Sachiva*) of a district bounded by the Vindhya, the Pārivātra (Western Vindhyas including the Aravalli range) and the Sindhu (the sea or a Central Indian stream bearing the same name). His nephew is called a *nṛipati* (king). Daksha, the young brother of the ruler, excavated a well in the year 589 (=A.D. 533-34).

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, 1886, 142; *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, 1926, 259 (verse 9 of Sañjam grant); *cf. Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 177 (reference to a governor of Ujjain under the Pratihāra King Mahendrapāla II) In the Sañjam inscription it is claimed that at Ujjain an early Rāshṭrakūṭa king made the Gurjara and *other* lords his door-keepers (*Pratihāra*). It is not improbable that, like the Paramāras, the Gurjara lords brought to Ujjain were for a long time feudatories of the Rāshṭrakūṭas and the name *Pratihāra* had reference to their status under the Rāshṭrakūṭas, before the theory of descent from Lakshmaṇa was adumbrated. Incidentally it may be pointed out that the home territory (*Svavishaya*) of Nāgabhaṭa's line was in Marwar as is clear from the Jaina Kuvalayamāla and the Buchkala inscription.

question the strongest political powers in the Upper Ganges Valley. They anticipated to some extent the glorious achievements of Harsha, the brother-in-law, and, apparently, the successor (on the throne of Kanauj ?) of their last notable king Grahavarman.

Like the Maukharis, the **rulers of Bengal** too, seem to have thrown off the Gupta yoke in the second half of the sixth century A.D. In the fourth and fifth centuries Bengal undoubtedly acknowledged the suzerainty of the Gupta Empire. The reference to Samataṭa in Eastern Bengal as a *pratyanta* or border state in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of the emperor Samudra Gupta proves that the Imperial dominions must have embraced the whole of western and central Bengal, while the inclusion of northern Bengal (Paundravardhana *bhukti*) within the empire from the days of Kumāra Gupta I (A.D. 443-44) to A.D. 543-44[1] is sufficiently attested by the Dāmodarpur plates. Samataṭa, though originally outside the limits of the Imperial provinces, had nevertheless, been forced to feel the irresistible might of the Gupta arms. The Harāhā Inscription of Iśānavarman, however, shows that the political situation had changed completely about the middle of the sixth century A.D. A new power, *viz.*, that of the **Gauḍas**, was fast rising to importance in the valley of the Lower Ganges. Gauda was already known to Pānini[2] and the *Kautilīya Arthaśāstra*[3] The grammarian seems to associate it with the East.[4] A passage occurring in the *Matsya*, *Kūrma* and *Liṅga Purāṇas*[5] has, however, been taken to mean that the Śrāvastī region was the cradle of the Gauḍa people. But the passage in question does not occur in the corresponding text of the *Vāyu* and *Brahma Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata*[6]. In early literature the people of the Śrāvastī region are always referred to as the Kosalas. *Vātsyāyana*, the author of the *Kāmasūtra*, writing probably in the third or fourth century of the Christian era, refers to Gauda and Kosala as names of distinct countries[7] Gauḍa in the *Matsya-Kūrma-Liṅga* MSS may have been inserted as a Sanskritised form of Gonḍa in the same way as the term Madra-manḍala is

[1] For the date, see *Ep Ind.*, XVII, Oct., 1924, p. 345.

[2] VI. ii. 100.

[3] ii. 13.

[4] *Cf.* VI. ii, 99.

[5] *Nirmitā yena Śrāvastī Gauda-deśe dvijottamāh.*
Matsya, XII, 30, *cf. Liṅga*, I. 65
Nirmitā yena Śrāvastī Gauḍadeśe mahāpurī (*Kūrma*, I 20. 19).

[6] *Yajñe Śrāvastako rājā Śrāvastī yena nirmitā* (*Vāyu*, 88. 27; *Brahma*, VII. 53).
Tasya Śrāvastake jneyah Śrāvastī yena nirmitā (Mbh., III, 201. 4).

[7] For Kosalā, see *daśanachchhedya-prakaraṇam*; for Gauḍa, see *nakhachchhedya prakaraṇam* and *dārarakshika-prakaraṇam*.

employed to denote the Madras Presidency, by some modern *paṇḍits* of the Southern Presidency, as well as other scholars and journalists who are unacquainted with the topography of Ancient India.[2] In the Central Provinces the name "Gond" is very often Sanskritised into Gauḍa[3] Varāhamihira, writing in the sixth century A.D., places Gauḍaka in the Eastern division of India. He does not include Gauḍa in the list of countries situated in the *Madhyadeśa*. Mention is no doubt made of a place called Guḍa. But, if Alberuni[4] is to be believed, Gauḍa is Thanesar and not Oudh. The use of the term *Pañcha Gauḍa* as the designation of a territory embracing Northern India as far as Kanauj and the river Sarasvatī, is distinctly late and dates only from the twelfth century A.D. The term is possibly reminiscent of the Gauḍa empire of Dharmapāla and Devapāla, and cannot be equated with the ancient realm of the Gauḍas in the early centuries of the Christian era. The distinct statement in the Harāhā Inscription that the Gauḍas were on the seashore clearly suggests that the Bengal littoral and not Oudh, was the seat of the people in the sixth century A.D. In the next century, their king Śaśāṅka is found in possession of Karṇasuvarṇa near Murshidābād. In the century that follows a Gauḍa appears, in the *Gauḍa-vaho* of Vākpati-rāja, as the occupant of the throne of Magadha. The zenith of Gauḍa power is reached in the ninth century when the Gauḍa dominion extends over the Gangetic Doāb and Kanauj. About the early kings of the Gauḍas our information is meagre. Certain copper-plate inscriptions, discovered in the Faridpur Burdwan[5] Districts, disclose the existence of three kings—Dharmāditya, Gopachandra[6] and Samāchāradeva, who are described as overlords of Navyāvakāśikā, Vāraka maṇḍala, and in one case, of Vardhamāna-*bhukti* (Burdwan Division). The Vappaghoshavāṭa inscription introduces to us a fourth king, *viz*., Jayanāga, who ruled at Karṇasuvarṇa. These kings are, however, not expressly referred to as Gauḍas. The earliest king, to whom that epithet is applied is the famous Śaśāṅka, the great rival of Rājyavardhana of Thanesar

[2] *Cf.* Giger's translation of *Mahāvaṁśa*, p. 6211.

[3] *Cf. Imperial Gazetteer of India*. Provincial Series. *Central Provinces*, p. 158.

[4] i. 300.

[5] Mallasārula Plate (*S. P. Patrikā*, 1344, 17).

[6] Gopachandra may be the *Gopākhya nṛpati* who was apparently a contemporary and rival of Prakaṭāditya, son of Bhānu Gupta (*Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa*, ed., G. *Śāstrī*, p. 637) It is not altogether improbable that *Dhakārākhya* (*ibid*., p. 644) is identical with Dharmāditya. Was he a younger brother (*anuja*) of *Vākārakhya* (Vajra) and *Pakārākhya* (Prakaṭāditya)? If this surmise turns out to be correct he may have belonged to the Gupta line.

and his brother Harsha. The title *Mahārājādhirāja* assumed by the Bengal kings mentioned above, leaves no room for doubt that they no longer acknowledged the suzerainty of the Guptas and set themselves up as independent sovereigns.

The uprising of the Pushyamitras, the invasions of the Huns and the intransigentism of provincial governors and feudatories, were not the only sources of trouble to the Guptas in the last days of their sovereignty. Along with foreign inroads and provincial insubordination we should not fail to take note of the **dissensions** in the Imperial family itself. The theory of a struggle amongst the sons of Kumāra Gupta I may or may not be true, but there is evidence to show that the descendants of Chandra Gupta II did not pull on well together, and the later kings who bore the Gupta name sometimes took opposite sides in the struggles and convulsions of the period. The later Imperial Guptas do not seem to have been on friendly terms with their Vakāṭaka cousins. Narendrasena Vākāṭaka, a great-grandson of Chandra Gupta II through his daughter Prabhāvatī, seems to have come into hostile contact with the lord of Mālava. Narendrasena's cousin Harisheṇa claims victories over Avantī. Inasmuch as the Guptas are associated with parts of Mālava as late as the time of Harsha, some of the victories gained by the Vākāṭakas must have been won over their Gupta cousins. In the seventh century A.D., Deva Gupta appears as an enemy of Harsha's family, while Mādhava Gupta was a friend.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that while the earlier Guptas were staunch Brāhmanists, some of whom did not scruple to engage in sacrifices involving the slaughter of living beings, the later kings, or at least some of them, *e.g.*, Budha (Buddha) Gupta, Tathāgata Gupta and Bālāditya had Buddhist leanings. As in the case of Aśoka after the Kaliṅga war and Harsha after his intimate relation with the Chinese Master of the Law, the change of religion probably had its repercussions on the military and political activities of the Empire. In this connection it is interesting to recall a story recorded by Hiuen Tsang. When "Mahirakula," the Hun tyrant ruling at Śākala, proceeded to invade the territory of Bālāditya, the latter said to his ministers, "I hear that these thieves are coming, and I *cannot fight with them* (their troops); by the permission of my ministers *I will conceal my poor person* among the bushes of the morass." Having said this he withdrew to an island with many of his subjects. Mihirakula came in pursuit but was taken alive as a captive. He was, however, set free and allowed to go away on the intercession of the Queen Mother.[1] We do not know how far

[1] Beal, *Si-yu-ki*, I, 168f.; Watters, I. 288-89.

the story is authentic. But it seems that Indians of the seventh century A.D. from whom the Chinese pilgrim must have derived his information, did not credit the later Buddhist rulers of the Gupta dynasty with the possession of much courage or military vigour, though they bear testimony to their kindness and piety. The misplaced clemency of Bālāditya and his mother helped to prolong the tyrannical rule of Mihirakula and gave Yaśodharman and the succeeding aspirants for imperial dominion, *viz.*, Īśānavarman and Prabhākara-vardhana, an opportunity of which they were not slow to take advantage and thereby seal the doom not only of the Hun (Yetha), but also of the Gupta domination in Northern India.

APPENDIX E

Kingdoms, Peoples and Dynasties of Trans-Vindhyan India chronologically arranged

Brahmana Period :—1. Nishadhas (capital Giriprastha, Mbh., III, 324. 12).
2. Vidarbhas (capital Kuṇḍina) and other Bhojas.
3. Dasyu tribes—Andhras, Śabaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas.

Sutra Period :—1. Māhishmatī (Māndhātā or Maheśvara, IA, 4, 346).
2. Bhṛigu-Kachchha (Broach).
3. Śūrpāraka (Sopara in the Koṅkaṇ).
4. Aśmaka (capital Paudanya, Bodhan)
5. Mūlaka (capital Pratishṭhāna).
6. Kaliṅga (capital Dantapura).
7. (?) Ukkala (N. Orissa).

Ramayanic Period :—Aryan Expansion south of the Godāvarī—settlement on the Pampā—exploration of Malaya, Mahendra and Laṅkā.

Maurya Period :— **Maurya Empire.**
1. Aparāntas proper (capital Śūrpāraka).
2. Bhojas (capital Kuṇḍina?).
3. Rāshṭrikas (capital Nāsik?).
4. Petenikas (of Pratishṭhāna?).
5. Pulindas (capital Pulinda-nagara).
6. Andhras (capital Bezvāḍa, etc.?).
7. Aṭavi.
8. Kaliṅgas (including Tosalī and Samāpā).
9. Viceroyalty of Suvarṇagiri.
10. Āhāra of Isila.

11. Cholas.
12. Pāṇḍyas.
13. Keralaputra.
14. Satiyaputra (Satyabhūmi of Keralolpatti?).
15. Tāmraparṇī (Ceylon).

Early Post MauryaPeriod:—1. Kingdom of Vidarbha.
2. Śātavāhanas of Dakshiṇāpatha.
3. Chetas of Kalinga.
4. Kingdom of Pithuḍ near Masulipatam.
5. „ „ Chola.
6. „ „ Pāṇḍya.
7. „ „ Kerala.
8. „ „ Ceylon (sometimes ruled by Chola princes).

Age of the Periplus :—1. Southern part of Ariake under Mambarus (or Nambanus ?).
2. Dachinabades under Saraganus and his successors (*i.e.*, the Deccan under the Śātavāhana-Śātakarṇis).
3. Damirica (Tamilakam, Draviḍa) including:—
   (*a*) Cerobothra (Keralaputra).
   (*b*) The Pandian Kingdom
   (*c*) (Kingdom of) Argaru (= Uragapura)
4. Masalia (Masulipatam).
5. Dosarene (= Tosalī).

Age of Ptolemy :—1. Kingdom of Baithana (Pratishṭhāna) ruled by Pulumāyi (Śātavāhana).
2. Kingdom of Hippokoura (Kolhapur), ruled by Baleokouros (Vilivāyakura).

3. Kingdom of Mousopalle (in the Kanarese Country).
4. Kingdom of Karoura ruled by Kerobothros (Keralaputra).
5. Pounnata (S. W Mysore).
6. Kingdom of the Aïoi (capital Kottiara in S. Travancore).
7. Kingdom of the Kareoi (Tāmraparṇī Valley).
8. Kingdom of Modoura (Madurā) ruled by 'Pandion' (Pāṇḍya).
9. Kingdom of the Batoi (capital Nikama).
10. Kingdom of Orthoura, ruled by "Sornagos" (Chola-Nāga ?)
11. Kingdom of Sora (Chola) ruled by Arkatos.
12. Kingdom of Malanga (Kāñchī ? Mavilangai ?), ruled by Basaronagas (Nāga ?)
13. Kingdom of Pitundra (Pithuḍa).

A. D. 150-350 :—1. Ābhīras (N. Mahārāshṭra and W India).
2. Vākāṭakas (Berar and adjoining provinces) and chiefs of Mahākāntāra.
3. Kingdoms of South Kosala, Kaurāla, Koṭṭura, Eraṇḍapalla, Devarāshṭra (under the Vāśishṭha family ?), Pishṭapura (under the Māṭhara-*kula* ?), Avamukta, Palakka, Kusthalapura.
4. Kingdom of Andhrāpatha (and Veṅgī): —
   (*a*) Ikshvākus.
   (*b*) Rulers of the Ānanda-*gotra* (Kandarapura)

(c) Bṛihatphalāyanas of Kudura, etc.
(d) Śālaṅkāyanas (Salakenoi of Ptolemy ?) of Veṅgīpura, one of whom was Hastivarman of Veṅgī.

5. Pallavas of Kāñchī,
6. Śātakarṇis of Kuntala.

A. D. 350-600 :—1. Traikuṭakas and Mauryas of the Koṅkaṇ ; and Lāṭas, Nāgas and Gurjaras of South Gujarāṭ.
2. Vākāṭakas (C. Deccan).
3. Kaṭachchuris (N. Mahārāshṭra and Mālwa).
4. Kings of Śarabhapura (S. Kosala ?).
5. Pāṇḍavas of Mekalā.
6. Kingdoms of Udra, Koṅgoda, Kaliṅga [under the Vaśishṭha family, the Māṭhara-kula, the Mudgala family (*Ep. Ind.* xxiii. 199ff) and Eastern Gaṅgas] : Leṇḍuluṛa (under Vishṇukuṇḍins) in East Deccan.
7. Pallavas of Kāñchī (in Dramila or Draviḍa).
8. Cholas, Pāṇḍyas, Mūshakas and Keralas of the Far South.
9. Gaṅgas and Ālupas of S. Mysore, Shimoga and S. Kanara.
10. Bāṇas of E Mysore and N. Arcot, Kekayas of Dāvaṇgere *tāluk*, Kadambas of Vaijayantī, etc. and Sendrakas of Nāgarakhaṇḍa (N. W Mysore), or of the Tumkur region.
11. Nalas of (a) Pushkarī who governed the Poḍāgaḍh region (Jeypore

Agency), (*b*) Yeotmal in Berar and perhaps also (*c*) the Bellary District.

12. Early Chalukyas of Vātāpi.

After A. D. 600 :—1. Śilāhāras of Koṅkan.

2. Early Chālukyas, Rāshṭrakuṭas including the lines of Mānadeśa, etc., Later Chālukyas, Kalachuryas and Yādavas of W. Deccan.
3. Haihayas, Kalachuris or Chedis of Tripurī and Ratnapura, and Nāgas of Chakrakūṭa (C.P.)
4. Eastern Chālukyas, Chiefs of Velnāṇḍu, and Kākatīyas of the Telugu Country, Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and Orissa, Karas, Śabaras (? Śaśadhara and Pāṇḍu family) and Somavaṁśi Guptas of Mahānadī Valley (N E Deccan).
5. Western Gaṅgas, Śāntaras and Hoysalas (Mysore).
6. Pallavas of Kāñchī, Vaidumbas of Renāṇḍu, Kalabhras of the Tinnevelly District, Cholas of Tanjore, Varmans of Kerala and Kolamba, and Pāṇḍyas of Madurā (Far South).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INDEX

A

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

GENERAL INDEX

B

D

E

F

I

J

L

R

T

U

CORRECTIONS

Page	Line	For	Read
38n	16	V. V Vaidya	C. V. Vaidya
42	10	Abhipratarin	Abhipratārin
59n	7	Bbh	Mbh
79n	5	Mcridle	McCrindle
205	14	Kālavarna	Kākavarna
215	15	Armaic	Aramaic
224	10	Madyamika	Madhyamikā
225n	5	EMI	EHI
294	last	Ptolemy II, Philadelphos	Ptolemy II Philadelphos
318	24	Dand-asamalā	Daṇḍa Samatā
332n	2	Chandra	Chanda
374n	6	Pārini	Pāṇini
399	2	unofen	unoften
524n	11	Yainya Gupta	Vainya Gupta
216	37	1491	149
278	36	Gedrolic	Gedrosia
310	29	successor	successors

SOME ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Page	Line	
479, 552		Recently Dr. D. C. Sircar has come across evidence in the Sumaṇḍala (Orissa) inscription which indicates that in 569 one Pṛithivi-Vigraha held Kaliṅga apparently as a Gupta vassal. Cf IHQ, XXVI, March, 1950.

OPINIONS AND REVIEWS

I.—Political History of Ancient India

From the Accession Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Dynasty

Published by the Calcutta University

Opinions on the earlier editions and on Part I:-

The Hindusthan Review.—It is learned and luminous and is a scientific treatise based on the results of research into the records and materials of ancient Indian history, of which it is a sound and accurate digest, interestingly put together It is about the best text-book of the subject it deals with.

Dr. L. D. Barnett. London.—The author treats his materials with a certain degree of originality, but at the same time he preserves throughout a well-balanced judgment and never sacrifices critical caution to the passion for novel theories . This interesting book . . . shews judgment, ingenuity, and learning And not the least of the author's merits is that he can write plain English

Dr. F. W. Thomas.—I have profited by a closer acquaintance with your Political History and other writings, which are really models of sound judgment combined with full knowledge

Professor Hultzsch, Halle, Germany.—Your valuable work ......is the outcome of extensive researches and throws much light on darkest and most debated periods of Indian history. You have succeeded in building up an intelligible account from the stray and imperfect materials which are available to the historian of those times.

Professor Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany.—Your splendid volume ....What an enormous mass of evidence has been collected and discussed in this work, an important feature of which is the quotation of the original texts along with their translation which makes it easy to control the conclusions arrived at. The ancient geography, not less than the ancient history of India, has been greatly furthered by your researches and much new light has been thrown on some of the most vexed problems of Indian Archaeology and Chronology.

The indices are very copious and the study of your work is greatly facilitated by them.

Professor Pelliot, Paris.—Le nom de L'auteur est garant du serieux du travail.

Professor Jarl Charpentier Upsala, Sweden.—Professor Ray Chaudhury belongs to a set of young Hindu scholars who, combining the traditional education of a Pandit with a thorough training in English, German or French Universities, have lately been carrying on deep and fruitful researches in the various domains of Indian lore ....Even the student, who on essential points does differ widely from the opinions expressed by Professor Ray Chaudhury, must willingly recognize his high merits as a scholar.

Professor A. Schepotieff, Ufa, Russia.—For our study of the history of the Ancient Age your Political History of Ancient India is of very great importance (trans. from original).

C. E. A. W. Oldham (J. R. A. S. 1928, July)—Part I of Professor Ray Chaudhuri's work deals with the period from Parikṣit to Bimbisāra The author seeks to show, as he tells us in his preface, "that chronological relation of the national transactions before 600 B.C. is not impossible" He has laid under contribution the usual authorities, the Vedic, Puranic, Buddhist, and Jaina texts—though he does not appear to place much reliance upon the last-named (*cf.* pp. 6 and 72). A vast mass of records has been collated, and the evidence marshalled in a very concise and able, and in some respects original, manner. The apposite quotations from the original texts are useful. Professor Ray Chaudhuri regards Parikṣit I and Parıksit II, as they are named by the late Mr. Pargiter in his *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, as being probably one and the same king, and as identifiable with the Vedic Parikṣit. By "the great Janaka" he refers to the Janaka of the later Vedic texts, whose court is said to have been thronged with Brāhmaṇas, and not to the traditional first king Janaka, the eponymous founder of the Janaka-vaṁśa, or to Janaka Sīradhvaja, the reputed father of Sītā. Synchronizing Gunākhya Śāṅkhāyana with Āśvalāyana and the Buddha, he inclines, it seems, to place Parikṣit in the ninth, and the "great Janaka" in the seventh century B.C. though he wisely avoids coming to any positive couclusion as to these debatable dates, and points out that if the evidence of the Purāṇas were accepted we would have to place them some five centuries earlier. If it could be established that Parikṣit came into power at the beginning of the ninth century, or the end of the tenth, this would help to corroborate the approximate chronology suggested by Mr. Pargiter, having regard also to the synchronism between Senājit Bārhadratha and Adhisīmakṛṣṇa. But until more convincing evidence is discovered

most scholars will probably agree in the verdict of Vincent Smith that nothing approaching exact chornology is yet available for periods anterior to about 650 B.C.

Much of the matter in Part II will perhaps be familiar to students of Indian history; but it has been arranged in a fresh and scholarly manner, while several important suggestions have been made on different questions. One or two of these may be cited as examples. On pp. 72-73 reasons are set forth for accepting the Ceylon tradition that Śiśunāga was later than Bimbisāra. The view recorded by Mahāmahopadhāya (*sic*) H. P. Śāstri that the ultimate dismemberment of the Mauryan empire was due to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmanas, is vigorously controverted. Whatever other causes may have operated, and Professor Ray Chaudhuri undoubtedly lays his finger on more than one such, Brāhmanical influences cannot be ignored. The arguments used for holding that Demetrius,[1] rather than Menander, was the Yavana invader of the Madhyadeśa in the time of Pusyamitra and that Simuka, the founder of the Sātavāhana dynasty, must be placed in the first century B.C., deserve careful consideration.

Since Hoernle made his well-known suggestions as to the identity of Devagupta, mentioned in two inscriptions of Harṣavardhana, several writers have attempted to frame the history of the later Guptas of Eastern Mālava and Bihār and the Maukharis of Kanauj The period presents many difficulties, which are not likely to be solved until some further evidence reveals itself. Having regard to the conditions of the times and the bitter enmity of the Mukharis, who were then very powerful, it seems unlikely that the Susthitavarman mentioned in the Aphsand (*sic*) inscription of Ādityasena as having been defeated by Mahāsenagupta of E. Mālava, could have been the king of Kāmarūpa, as the author states Fleet's suggestion that he was the Maukhari king of that name,[2] whom we know to have been contemporaneous with Mahāsenagupta, seems more probable.

Not the least valuable part of the contents of this volume are the numerous comments on the geographical information supplied in the records quoted; and it is a matter of regret that of the five maps entered in the table of Contents (p. xvi), only one, *viz*, that of "Bhāratavarsha" appears in the volume before us. As regards this map we are not told what specific period, if any, it refers to. In any case, the positions assigned to the Nisādas, S. Kosala, Kamboja, and the Rikṣa mountains seem to call for some explanation. On the

[1] For the latest reading of the Hāthīgumphā inscription reference to the Yavana king, see *JBORS.*, XIII, 228.

[2] No Maukhari king of that name is known (H. C. R. C.).

other hand, the geographical information given in the text is extensive, and often suggestive, and it indicates that much attention has been devoted to this important auxiliary to ancient Indian historical research. The indexes, both bibliographical and general, have been very well prepared.

Professor A. Barriedale Keith, Edinburgh.— I have read through the work and find it to contain much that is valuable. The author has arrived at clearly cut opinions on many of the chief difficulties in the history of early India ; he has formulated them effectively, and as a result, even when they do not comment themselves as final solutions, they will serve to promote the discussion and to facilitate further fruitful research. He observes a due sense of proportion and is well read in the literature. The work accordingly may justly be deemed amost valuable contribution to the subject-matter of which it treats.

Professor Wilh Geiger, Munchen-Newbiberg, Germany.—I highly appreciate Mr Ray Chaudhuri's work as a most happy combination of sound scientific method and enormous knowledge of both Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical literature. The work is written in lucid style in spite of its intricate subject and affords a mass of valuable evidence, throwing much light on the whole period of Indian History dealt in it I see with special pleasure and satisfaction that we now are enabled by the author's penetrating researches to start in Indian chronology from the 9th instead of the 6th or 5th century B.C.

Professor Jackson, Columbia University, New York.—I can see the scholarly research which you have put into the volume, and am glad to have such a work future reference in my historical studies

Professor Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Brussels, Belgium.— I believe that the book is well designed and has the twofold merit of collecting a vast amount (and in some chapters, an exhaustive one) of references, and of giving a clear and reasonable *exposé* of the main line of this history. I agree with the author on several controverted points of chronology.

Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids.—Dr. Chaudhuri has made debtors of us all.

S. M. Edwards (The Indian Antiquary, July 1927, p. 140).— Professor Ray Chaudhuri's book forms a solid contribution to the discussion of the various problems implicit in the early history of India.

Professor E. J. Rapson, Cambridge.—My best thanks for the kind present of a copy of the "Political History of Ancient India," which I am very glad to possess and which I shall find most useful for reference.

Professor Sten Konow, Norway.—The book is a very useful contribution.

Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.—I have to refer to it very often, both for corroboration of historical facts of the epic and for geographical information and the excellent maps included in the volume. It has been always a matter of great gratification to me that you have adopted my views with reference to the Sātavāhanas and at last given them, in a standard history of India the appellation by which they call themselves. rather than accept the doubtful description of them given by the late Purānas.

Professor Nilkanta Sastri,- Your excellent Ancient History of India. I have been using it on every conceivable occasion.

Sitaram Kohli, Lahore.—I have immensely liked your book "Political History of Ancient India."

C. S. Srinivasachari, South India. -Our author rightly holds the balance between the views of Pargiter which would give excessive value to Kshatriya tradition whose date allowed of manipulation to serve dynastic ends and the value of Vedic tradition whose two strong points are its priority of date and freedom from textual corruption

W. Charles de Silva, Colombo—I have the greatest pleasure to express my high appreciation of your very valuable and learned article (Part I of the Political History).

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins.—It is a fine augury for Indian scholarship when native scholars of the first rank take seriously in hand the great problem of untangling the web of Indian history. To this work your book is a valuable contribution.

Professor H. Jacobi, Bonn.—Very suggestive and contains some important details.

Professor F. Otto Schrader.--I have read the book with increasing interest and do not hesitate to say that it contains a great many details which will be found useful by later historians The portion I enjoyed most is that on the sixteen Mahājanapadas.

II. The Early History of the Vaishnava Sect

Published by the Calcutta University

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, America.—Your book has given me great satisfaction...... I am particularly pleased to see an incisive study of this kind in the realm of religious history.........Believe me, in the hope of further contributions of this character from your able pen........

Professor A. Berriedale Keith, Edinburgh University,—While I do not concur in your view as to the original character of Kṛṣṇa, I

recognise the care with which you have investigated the issue, and value highly the elaborate collation of the evidence which your work contains, and which will render it of much service to all students of this doubtless insoluble problem. The stress laid on the epigraphic evidence and the full use made of it is of special value, while in many details your opinions are of interest and value, as in the case of the date of Pāṇini.........

Sir George Grierson.—Very interesting and informing.. ... The book is full of matter which is of great importance for the history of religion in India and will form a valued addition to my collection of books on the subject.........

F. E. Pargiter, Oxford.—I agree with you in discarding various theories, but I don't think Krṣna Devakīputra is the famous Krṣna, and it seems to me your exposition can stand just as well without the identification as with it. Your book will help to elucidate the whole matter, but are you sure that the cult does not owe something to Christianity?

Professor F. Otto Schrader, Kiel, Germany.—I perfectly agree with your opinion that Chāndogya passage on Krṣna Devakīputra and his teaching is to be considered as the first historical record of Bhāgavatism There were, of course, many Krṣnas, but to conjecture that more than one was (*sic*) also a Devakīputra, is to my mind an unscientific boldness which is the less justifiable as the teachings mentioned in that passage, as you show, perfectly agree with those, *e.g*. of the Bhagavad-gītā and the Rk quoted with the famous तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं........

Professor Garbe, Tubingem, Germany.—I have read your book with the greatest interest and perfectly agree with you in the main points, as to the personality of Krṣna and the development of Bhāgavatism ....You have brought together much important material and elucidated the dark early history of Bhāgavatism as far as possible.

The Times Literary Supplement, May 12, 1921.——The lectures of Mr. Hemchandra Ray Chaudhuri on the early history of the Vaishṇava Sect read almost as would a Bampton lecture on the "Historical Christ" to a Christian audience. They are an attempt to disentangle the authentic figure of Krishṇa from the mass of Puranic legend and gross tradition, from the wild conjectures and mistaken, if reasoned, theories which surround his name. The worship of Krishṇa is not a superstitious idolatry; it is the expression of the Bhakti, the devotional faith of an intellectual people, and many missionaries, ill-equipped for dealing with a dimly understood creed would do well to study this little volume.............

Journal Asiatique, January-March, 1923, Paris.—Dans le domaine historique, signalons un travail plein de merite de M. Hemchandra Ray Chaudhuri. *Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect* (Dr. Jules Bloch of Paris).

Dr. Jules Block, Paris.—My Guru, Sylvain Levi, who has come back from his travels, told me also of his esteem for that book.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.—The scope of this small book is rightly expressed in its title. The author who is Lecturer in History in the Calcutta University, has collected and discussed statements, reference, and allusions from the early literature to throw light on the position and life of Kr̥ṣna and the growth of Bhāgavatism. He deals with the various theories that have been put forward, and with good reasons discredits the views that Kr̥ṣna Vāsudeva was a solar deity or a tribal god or a vegetation deity. He is right in treating Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva as one person, the Vṛṣni chief, but he unnecessarily identifies him with Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra, the scholar mentioned in the Chāndogya Upanishad ... . (F. E. Pargiter).

The Bombay Chronicle, June 19, 1921.——Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhury of the Calcutta University has collected much valuable material from which he has succeeded in tracing the origin and growth of the Vaishnava creed. The Historicity of Srikrishna—or as the author calls him, Krishna Vāsudeva, is also handled with remarkable clearness ....,

A. Govindacharya Svamin.—I pay you a most deserved compliment upon your acquaintance with the Azhvars and Sri Vaishnavism of southern India as evidenced in your learned book *the Early History of the Vaishnava Sect.*

III. Studies in Indian Antiquities

Demy 8vo. Pp xvi, 211

Published by the Calcutta University

Professor E. J. Rapson, Cambridge.—Dr. Raychaudhuri's essays on Indian History and Antiquities are always well-informed, thoughtful and suggestive.

E. J. Thomas (J. R. A. S., October, 1933, p. 925).—The study which Dr. Raychaudhuri has already devoted to ancient Indian history is well known. In the present book he discusses some of the geographical problems which still face the historians, as well as Vedic, epic, and specially historical questions .. He has shown that Indian historical scholarship is proceeding on sound lines of its own and achieving independent results.